

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

QUARTERLY

Vol. XIV

JANUARY, 1929

No. 1

EDITORIAL

ONE OF THE SIGNS THAT WE HAVE NOT ABSOLUTELY LOST all taste for serious thinking is seen in our new demand for biography. If we have no patience with truth in the abstract, with sound doctrine as doctrine, we are still, many of us, tolerant of noble principles as worked out in the lives of men who have left their tool marks on their times. Some of these men have made great names in some one line of service chiefly, but yet have accomplished enough in other lines to give them credit for successful lives.

One such was George Whitefield, so closely associated with the Wesleys and early Methodism. Not only a great preacher, but with a mind that furthered higher education and a heart that gave a great impetus to philanthropy, Whitefield exerted a profound influence on the England and America of his day, and on the generations that have followed his.

Responding to our request, Rev. Albert D. Belden, Superintendent of Whitefield's Central Mission, London, has written upon George Whitefield—His Influence on His Times. He has given us, not a biography in the sense of the details of Whitefield's life, but a review of those great contacts wherein the renowned

preacher may be said to have done much to shape the religious, philanthropic, and educational ideas of these two sister lands.

One of the impressions that remains after reading this most attractive study is, that a real preacher must have that tremendous earnestness that moves men, however it is manifested. Few can have Whitefield's voice and general personality, but every man who stands in a pulpit should have his concern for lost men and his broad sympathies.

It is hard to comprehend the attitude of such a man toward slavery, but it is an illuminating evidence of the fact that certain moral perceptions are matters of slow development, and in the same individual the most progressive ideas on some things may exist alongside the most laggard views on others. The exhibition of this very trait in Whitefield gives us reason at once for humility and for thanksgiving.

A TRADITIONAL VIEW OF ANYTHING MAY BE CORRECT, SO far as it goes, and still fall far short of a full revelation of the facts and their significance. There are traditional expositions of Scripture which are true enough, but they fail to show in a given passage some rich meaning because, lying beneath the surface, customary treatment has not found it. Yet the point overlooked may be essential to full understanding.

In Dr. McQuilkin's study of *The Parable of the Talents* we have an example of what may be discovered when more than the ordinary scrutiny and thought are bestowed. Of all the sermons delivered upon this striking passage, how many have approached it from the angle of view here, and so developed the phase of the picture we have before us?

Although he makes some remarks on the fundamental idea of the parable, that of trusteeship, and on the great responsibility that this involves, Dr. McQuilkin does not present the customary disquisition on these points, but directs attention chiefly to the "goods" delivered by the householder to his servants as their working capital. The more common interpretation takes "goods" as referring to the natural abilities of the servants, but here quite another meaning is attached to them. It is held that the parable has something "evangelically esoteric about it," being for "initiated souls," and that it presents these "goods" as belonging among the Lord's own peculiar riches, which He bestows for particular purposes upon those who are His accepted servants. Other portions of the New Testament are drawn upon to reveal the nature of the gifts thus bestowed, some of which are listed and considered here.

This treatment of the parable is quite away from the beaten track, and will repay the most thoughtful reading.

NO WORK IN WHICH THE CHURCH IS ENGAGED HAS been so persistently attacked as foreign missions. Not only is this true, but the very preaching of the Gospel to the non-Christian world has its opponents among church members as well as among the frankly irreligious. Then from both these sources come criticisms of the way foreign missionary enterprises are run, particularly with reference to their financial side.

However, all things considered, the missionary and his work are better understood and more highly respected than formerly. Yet even today occasional attacks, in periodicals of large circulation among readers of intelligence, so seriously misrepresent the cause as to

demand a reply. Some months ago an article of this nature led us to invite Dr. Speer to answer it through these pages. Under the heading, *Some Recent Criticisms of Foreign Missions*, he reviews the whole subject of missionary criticism and so conclusively vindicates present missionary activities that this monograph is a valuable contribution to the literature of that work.

After a few paragraphs devoted to different kinds of criticism—hostile and friendly, that from without and that from within—he contrasts earlier criticism with the present. As a general thing, Dr. Speer believes, it is better to leave unfriendly critics to their often contradictory utterances. But the missionary enterprise must be examining itself. The important points are “fundamental worthwhileness” and “general processes and particular methods.”

The major portion of the paper is given to an analysis of recent constructive criticism, as touching consolidation, economy, overturn of personnel, the expenses of missionaries, and national churches. The section on economy is a masterly answer to a large part of the criticism that appears.

Ministers and others actively engaged in presenting the cause of foreign missions will rejoice in this paper, for Dr. Speer not only furnishes the means for effectively answering charges, but incidentally provides means for strengthening the confidence and increasing the sympathy of church members toward their missionary boards and their missionaries.

THREE PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS OF CANADA HAVE had the faith and courage to engage in a great adventure. Sinking their own ecclesiastical identities they have united as a single church, while the Christian world

has looked on and speculated as to the outcome. Thus there came into being, on June 10, 1925, the United Church of Canada, formed of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational bodies in that country.

One of the leading spirits in the movement resulting in this historic union was Dr. S. D. Chown, of the Methodist Church, to whom was assigned the honor of making the formal announcement of its successful consummation. As there have been various rumors respecting the success of this significant Canadian venture, we have asked Dr. Chown to give us a brief account of it, particularly with respect to its results. This he has done in Church Union in Canada.

After a short but informing historical sketch of the movement we have a concise but important statement of the underlying motives, and the rest of the paper is devoted to a survey of the results achieved in less than four years. This article will have, as it deserves, at least as close attention as anything on church history that has appeared in this quarterly.

Naturally, any movement involving a change in time-honored traditions, individual affiliations, ancient terminology, and all else affected by so radical a step, might well rouse apprehension, prejudice, and fear. No doubt these were all factors in the problem as it was slowly worked out, but Dr. Chown has prudently avoided their discussion here. He has also quite sympathetically and tactfully referred to certain Christian communions which have so far felt unable to cast in their lot with the new church because of certain honest convictions which deserve the sincere respect of the ones that have participated in this noteworthy Christian enterprise.

THE DISCOVERY OF AMERICA AND THE GERMAN REFORMATION, with the tremendous changes they involved, have more or less obscured for us today other momentous events of that period. We are apt to forget how great a menace and even scourge the Turkish armies were for Europe in Luther's time. Four hundred years ago this year Vienna was besieged by the Turks. In fact, for generations, including the days of Columbus and Luther, the Turkish problem was never wholly absent from eastern Europe.

The great Reformer himself became interested in its Providential and ethical aspects, and this phase of his career forms the theme of Dr. Dau's paper upon Luther and the Turkish Invasion of Western Europe. Here, as in the Reformation itself, Luther's moral courage and outspoken defense of right as he saw it are in evidence. The article deals largely with published opinions relative to the rightness or wrongness of resistance to the Turks, as their writers viewed things. The Pope himself was prominent in the controversy that arose.

Luther firmly held that the invasion was a scourge in the hand of God, visited upon the people of Europe for their sins, and he pointed out the inconsistency of Christendom being unprepared in heart as well as in arms when contemplating war.

Valuable as this article is for its light upon Luther's character as brought out by the historic events dealt with, and for the richness of its documentary material, its chief interest for today is to be found in its revelation of Luther's conscientious attitude toward war in general. Considerable space is wisely devoted to this, with sufficient quotations from Luther himself to make his position unmistakably clear.

THE OUTPOURING OF BOOKS UPON IMPORTANT SUBJECTS in our time leaves the book lover with a feeling of being adrift upon a literary sea. It is with a sense of relief that he can turn to the reviews of many works he has no time to open, and so in some fashion keep himself informed upon what is being written. We have in this issue sufficiently full reviews of these volumes to repay well the reading of this department:

The Christian Experience of Forgiveness.—*Mackintosh*.

The Spiritual Element in History.—*McLaughlin*.

The Psychology of Character.—*Roback*.

Life and I.—*Bradford*.

A Florentine Diary.—*Landucci*.

Cyprian.—*Blakeney*.

R. M. K.

GEORGE WHITEFIELD—HIS INFLUENCE ON HIS TIMES

By REV. ALBERT D. BELDEN, B.D., (Lond.), Superintendent Minister,
Whitefield's, London

“GEORGE WHITEFIELD was the first man who treated Great Britain and America as if they both belonged to him. He passed from the one to the other as though they were a pair of rural villages, and he was minister in charge of the parish. George Whitefield took a couple of continents under his wing; and the wing proved capacious enough for the task.”

So writes the brilliant Australian essayist Frank W. Boreham, and the tribute is well justified, and the reminder timely for our generation. The two great English speaking nations have in common the most remarkable evangelist of Christian history, whose influence upon the past and present life of both peoples is quite indelible and still progressing. Whether we regard the history of evangelical Christianity in its narrower individualistic development and mark the progress of the evangelical churches since Whitefield's day, or whether we take into our survey, as we should do, the wide diffusion of the spirit of Christianity in the social life of our age, both developments take their initial impetus from the fiery eloquence and indefatigable toil of this glowing herald of the Christian salvation.

It is common to couple Wesley's name with Whitefield's in this mighty achievement and certainly in the Providence of God their careers were most curiously intertwined. We may describe Whitefield as the

pioneer evangelist of their great joint movement and Wesley as the constructive evangelist. Many years ago a writer in the North British Review emphasized this distinction thus: "Whitefield was like a powder-blast in the quarry and would by one explosive sermon shake a district and detach materials for other men's long work. Wesley loved to split and trim each fragment into uniform and polished stones. Whitefield had not patience for ecclesiastical policy—Wesley was always constructing societies."

THE PRINCE OF PULPIT ORATORS

But after all, it is to the pioneer that we owe the launching of the grand effort. Whilst it was through Charles Wesley that George Whitefield found conversion, and by John Wesley that he was drawn into the Holy Club at Oxford, it is nevertheless doubtful if there would have been any evangelical revival at all if Whitefield had been other than he was, the master-evangelist of all time, and if he had not discovered the grace and the audacity to initiate *out-of-church preaching*. It was the bringing of the Gospel into the open air that gave to it the contagion, as it were, of the very atmosphere itself, that freed it from the artificialities and intolerable stuffiness of a dull and dead ecclesiasticism and made it again part of the vital experience of mankind. For this task, from which Wesley shrank at first, George Whitefield was peculiarly fitted. He was powerfully built physically and possessed a voice of peculiar resonance.

Benjamin Franklin has left on record the story of his attempt to compute the range of Whitefield's voice while the latter was preaching in Philadelphia. He says: "Whitefield preached one evening from the top of the Court-house steps, which are in the middle of

Market Street and on the west side of Second Street, which crosses it at right angles. Both streets were filled with hearers to a considerable distance, and being among the hindmost in Market Street, I had the curiosity to learn how far he could be heard, by retiring backward down the street toward the river, and I found his voice distinct till I came near Front Street. . . . I computed that he might well be heard by more than 30,000 people. This reconciled me to the newspaper accounts of his having preached to 25,000 in the fields."

The influence of Whitefield as a preacher upon contemporaries of such outstanding and varied caliber as the polite Chesterfield, the skeptical Hume, the aristocratic Bolingbroke, the cool, philosophic Franklin, is outstanding proof of his genius. It has been well said that not only "enthusiastic amateurs like Garrick, who used to weep and tremble at his bursts of passion, but even the colder critics of the Walpole School were surprised into sympathy and reluctant wonder." He was as much at home with polite select audiences as with tens of thousands of humble folk on the streets or in the fields. He possessed great versatility of style, was always natural and displayed a creative genius of great beauty and charm. He was a definite and careful student of the art of oratory, rebuked the preachers of his time for their neglect of its study, and provided for its teaching in such organizations as he could influence, like his orphan asylum.

The number of really great lives kindled at his torch is proof that history has not falsely idealized this man. Hervey, Toplady, Doddridge, Newton, Robert Robinson, Watts, Rankin, Venn, and Joss in England, and in America, Benjamin Franklin—inspired though not converted, Samuel Hopkins, Gilbert Tennent, David

Brainerd, and Samuel Davies, the father of the Presbyterian Church in Virginia, are but a few of the notable personalities he captured for Christ, most of them becoming in their turn "fishers of men."

It has often been claimed that Whitefield's power did not extend to the written page and that his sermons in print are cold and dull. It is true that his work was peculiarly dependent upon his amazingly expressive features and his organ-like voice, but there are some impressive testimonies to a peculiar unction that attended his sermons in printed form. Samuel Morris, a resident of Virginia, invited his neighbors to his house to hear a volume of Whitefield's sermons read. The result was extraordinary; melting scenes occurred, and a fire of conversion was kindled. Multitudes thronged to hear the reading of these sermons until at last a meeting house was built for mere reading, and thus the Presbyterian Church in Virginia was founded.

No preacher of any generation commanded greater crowds or had a more extensive hearing than George Whitefield. He was above all preachers in history the apostle of the common people. He addressed twenty-five thousand at a time at Bristol and other places in the old land, sixty thousand on Boston Common, twenty thousand at Philadelphia, while audiences of ten thousand were commonplace to him, and he sustained a ministry of this magnitude unabated for thirty-four years! Like Wesley he often preached three and five times a day, day after day. Thirteen times he crossed the Atlantic in days when one crossing was a considerable adventure. Such preaching, peculiar both in quality and frequency, could not be achieved except at a great physical cost. We read that "often after leaving the pulpit he vomited blood," and those who knew him in-

timately tell us that "after a preaching paroxysm he lay panting on his couch, spent, breathless, and death-like." No wonder he wielded power.

His facing of great crowds in the open air was not without physical danger too, especially because he so often chose crowds on pleasure bent and so aroused the bitter opposition of vested interests. On one occasion while preaching in Ireland he was so seriously stoned as barely to escape with his life, and he bore the scars of his wounds for the rest of his days. Yet the fruitage of that particular occasion was notable enough in the winning for Christ of one John Edwards who afterwards preached at the Tabernacle in London and became a famous itinerant evangelist in England, Scotland, and Ireland.

It was this tremendous hearing for the Gospel gained by Whitefield among the masses of his time that rendered the popular feeling for religion mobile once more and so gave to John Wesley the opportunity for his more constructive movement. In happy reciprocity of influence, it was Wesley's missionary interest in Virginia that in turn kindled Whitefield's concern for the wider world and led him at last to carry his marvelous gift for preaching, into the new world.

THE IMPACT ON SOCIETY

It is, of course, hopelessly impossible to trace out and to measure the personal consequences of such a ministry as Whitefield's. We can only think with wondering awe of what it must have meant for men and women by the thousand to commence to live new lives by the grace of God. Whitefield set hundreds of thousands thinking for themselves again under the guidance of the New Testament on matters of the soul and the right conduct

of life. Narrow and intolerant as was his theology in many particulars, nevertheless his passion for the exaltation of Christ as the source of new life brought a host of men and women to the vital center of the Christian faith. To a very real degree, and in spite of his keen defense of Calvinism, Whitefield's ministry was above and beyond denominationalism.

Preaching on one occasion in Market Street, Philadelphia, from the balcony of the courthouse, he cried: " 'Father Abraham, whom have you in Heaven? Any Episcopalians?' 'No.' 'Any Presbyterians?' 'No.' 'Have you any Independents or Seceders?' 'No.' 'Have you any Methodists?' 'No, no, no!' 'Whom have you there?' 'We don't know those names here! All who are here are Christians—believers in Christ—men who have overcome by the blood of the Lamb and the word of his testimony.' 'Oh, is this the case? Then God help me, God help us all, to forget party names, and to become Christians indeed and in truth.' " As a direct result therefore of Whitefield's work all the churches were revived in both Britain and America and great new communities of converts sprang into being as, to take a supreme instance, the Methodists of England.

It is possible, of course, to claim with great reason, that had these great evangelists, Whitefield and Wesley, and the schools of evangelical thought and life they created been more alive to the social implications of the Gospel, a far greater work would have been achieved of a socially redemptive character. As it was, however, we can claim that in spite of much social blindness on Whitefield's part—fortunately Wesley was more socially sensitive in conscience—so powerful was the new spiritual impulse that it broke out spontaneously in

social redemption. The Christian Gospel is incorrigibly social in its impulse and outlook, and, though the crass individualism of all English life in the eighteenth century was a distinct and serious hindrance, the essential passion of the Gospel could not be entirely defeated. These social effects can be traced best through two great series of personalities, one series in Britain, the other in America.

No name stands higher among the English speaking peoples in the annals of social reform than that of Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury. His epic struggle for the workers of England, and especially for the suffering, exploited children, sprang directly from his new life in Christ. Lord Shaftesbury's actual spiritual father was John Wesley, but the fountain of his sublime energy in human service was that new evangelicalism let loose like a flood upon England in the torrential eloquence of George Whitefield.

"I am an Evangelical of the Evangelicals," declared Lord Shaftesbury, adding, "Christianity, as applied, is absolutely and essentially practical." In his brilliant *Life of Lord Shaftesbury*, Rev. J. Wesley Bready, M.A., B.D., has the following passage: "To Shaftesbury, as to all ardent Evangelicals, faith is illumination, dynamic; it is desire and restless energy for human betterment, a yearning to see the will of God 'done on earth as in Heaven.' Thus Shaftesbury was Evangelical . . . because it represented an ardent endeavor to appreciate the spirit of Jesus, and to apply that spirit to all the complicated problems of human relationship."

Shaftesbury late in life, reviewing his century's developments, was able to declare, "I am satisfied that most of the great philanthropic movements of the century have sprung from them" (the evangelicals).

Shaftesbury's own personal sacrifices were nobly great—mortgaging his estates to the hilt, despoiling his picture gallery of masterpiece after masterpiece, living in obscure simplicity, all to pay for the passion of social redemption his belief in Christ had inspired within him!

Outside Westminster Abbey, on the day of Earl Shaftesbury's funeral, one of the thousands of workingmen who stood bareheaded in the rain cried out: "Our Earl's gone! God A'mighty know'd how he loved us and we loved him. We shan't look upon his like again." Such was the devotion of millions, but the love so wondrously kindled and kindling was really that love of Christ for souls which George Whitefield revealed afresh to his generation.

But if George Whitefield's influence, allied with that of John Wesley, blessed England through the labors of the People's Earl, it was to bless a still wider area through another great social emancipator, William Wilberforce. It must always be a matter for profound regret that Whitefield, like many other eminent Christians of his period, was unenlightened in conscience regarding the sin of slavery—as still so many are regarding the sin of war. He himself held slaves for the working of his orphan establishments. He was fierce and courageous in defense of fair and good treatment of the slave and dared the wrath of slave owners again and again on their behalf, but he was blind to the iniquity of the institution.

All the more gratifying is it therefore to find that through his distinctive work of leading souls to individual salvation he set in train forces that ended eventually in the abolition of slavery. The story is interesting indeed. It seems that in 1769, just before Whitefield left England for the first time, in one of his audiences

there was a boy, ten years of age, whose tender heart was touched by the vivid eloquence of the preacher. In after years the impression faded somewhat, but the vital seed remained. One day that boy, William Wilberforce, just a gay young spark on pleasure bent, was traveling in Italy and picked up from the table of a hotel a religious book written by one Thomas Scott. From that moment Wilberforce forsook his frivolity and devoted himself to the cause of humanity for Christ's sake. Thomas Scott was a convert of John Newton, who was in turn one of John Wesley's greatest trophies of grace, and thus William Wilberforce's grand passion for human freedom is seen to take its impetus from that flood of evangelical fervor let loose first by Whitefield and again by Wesley.

But we cannot stay at Wilberforce. He marks but the second chapter, as Shaftesbury the first, in a great sequence of liberating events. Beyond Wilberforce, drawing inspiration from him, and also himself closely allied to the great evangelical tradition through the revival of free religion in America, looms the majestic figure of Abraham Lincoln. It is no mere coincidence that the ground in and around Boston and through New England is holy ground of freedom's history. That area, in which Whitefield's bones still rest, was the scene over and over again of mighty triumphs of Gospel appeal on the part of George Whitefield. It was ground on which souls were born again by thousands and brought from darkness to light, from bondage to the glorious liberty of the children of God. Abraham Lincoln's great speech at Gettysburg contains expressions that might be said fairly to sum up the age-long influence of Whitefield upon both England and America—"this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of free-

dom, that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

It is a mistake to think of Whitefield as an oratorical evangelist merely. He had a keen sense of the need for knowledge and was therefore an ardent apostle of education. He was from a humble home it is true, but the potboy of Gloucester became the student of Oxford University and a remorseless logician. It is not surprising therefore to find educational institutions springing up in the wake of his great missions. Thus, after his great work among the colliers at Kingswood, Bristol, they were inspired to found a school, the foundation stone of which they insisted Whitefield should lay. This Kingswood School afterwards became famous, and the sons of successive generations of Wesleyan Methodist ministers have been educated there.

When he landed in Georgia Whitefield began at once to take an interest in the waifs and strays whose parents had died and whose plight was a pitiful one. It was here he founded his famous orphanage, for the upkeep of which he constantly plunged himself into financial embarrassment. George Whitefield certainly "lived dangerously" so far as financial resources were concerned, giving such money as he obtained freely and fully to the welfare of his sacred charges, but he found that Providence never failed him. On one memorable occasion, such was his sublime honesty, he actually refused the gift of a large estate in Scotland valued at many thousands of pounds because he thought the owner was acting under stress of undue emotion.

It has been well written by Edward S. Ninde, that, "at a time when philanthropies were few and most men indifferent to their brothers' needs, Whitefield went everywhere pouring out his appeals for the distressed.

In both England and America he started a new tide of benevolence."

It was always Whitefield's ambition to see his orphanage at Savannah, called by him Bethesda, become the "fountain-head of Christian instruction for all the south land." He carried on a constant correspondence with his beloved charges and numbers of the boys brought thus under his care entered the Christian ministry. After his death the orphanage fell upon evil days, but it is gratifying to know that today it flourishes again, still on the same spot and under the old name of Bethesda.

Whitefield took a warm interest in Harvard and Yale, but perhaps the most impressive instance of his influence on American education lies in the great University of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia. The finest statue in the world to George Whitefield is the one, sculptured by Tait Mackenzie, which stands in the campus of the university, and it bears an inscription of eloquent tribute to the evangelist, acknowledging the origin of that great educational institution in Whitefield's original charity school of 1740. Princeton and Dartmouth also owed their origin to disciples and followers of the great evangelist, Whitefield having used his influence with the Earl of Dartmouth to secure the large sum of money with which the latter institution was founded. We may be sure that nothing would have delighted Whitefield's heart more than to have seen these mighty educational forces emerging from his humble but sincere efforts.

Every now and again the great historic triumphs of Christian history are revived in the church's memory in order that that history may repeat itself, not perhaps in the form of previous victories, but in their scope and spirit.

Evangelism in this modern world can no longer be wholly effective on the merely individualistic type of appeal that Whitefield and Wesley made. We are too conscious of the way in which the ancient sins of the race entrench themselves in great social institutions. These must be transformed if the mass of souls are to be set free to follow Christ. If, as the story of Whitefield's influence proves, the genuinely changed heart yearns towards the changed city, it is equally true that the changed city releases the repressed impulses of the better self in men and gives scope to the divine nature in the individual soul, especially when the changing of the city is the result of the sacrificial labors of regenerated souls.

There dawns upon the mind of our time, therefore, a dazzling prospect. The evangelism of individuals by Whitefield and Wesley succeeded, in spite of a dulled social conscience and blurred social vision, in achieving vast transformations of society. What might not be achieved by a church just as divinely impassioned and even more psychologically sound in her approach to individual souls, but equipped also with a clear vision and a passionate determination regarding that right organization of social life which Jesus called the Kingdom of God? If the success of the former evangelism has been the cleansing of many reproaches from Christian civilization, will not the uniting of the individual and the social Gospels in the same fire of the Holy Ghost be the bringing in of the world-wide Kingdom—the actual building of the City of God upon the earth?

LONDON, ENGLAND.

THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS

By H. H. McQUILKIN, D.D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church,
Orange, New Jersey

THE PARABLE OF THE TALENTS, as it is recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, forms a part of Christ's discourse on His second advent. This discourse, which comprises the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of the Gospel, is predictive and judicial in character. In it the veil is drawn aside for the moment and we catch a glimpse of the everlasting destination toward which our lives are moving. The wise virgins, the faithful servants, the ministering righteous, who pass before our vision in turn in the three parable-pictures, are admitted at last respectively to the marriage feast, the joy of ownership, eternal life; while the foolish virgins are shut out from the bridegroom and the wedding festivities, the slothful servant goes out into the outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth, and the selfish, callous passers-by, who heeded not the distressed fellow creatures about them on the way are sent away into everlasting punishment. The solemn echoes of the Day of Judgment sound through every word of the discourse. Our earthly life and conduct take on eternal meaning as their immortal issues stand out in sharp outline in the picture.

The fundamental idea underlying the parable is that of trusteeship. Some time ago a great bank was chartered in the city of Newark, New Jersey, with vast capital resources, and the name chosen for the institution is The Guardian Trust Company. In that same

city there is another bank called The Fidelity Trust Company. These names are representative, and they are tremendously significant. They bear eloquent testimony to the recognized qualifications demanded of banks by those who do business with them—"Guardian," emphasizing protective vigilance; "Fidelity," stressing faithfulness to the "trust" committed. Business men show profound insight and sagacity in choosing such names as these, which perform the double function of profession and solicitation. They are declarative of character, and they are provocative of confidence. This is how the financial world views trusteeship. There must be guardianship and there must be fidelity.

The matter is no different in the higher realms of life. Trusteeship is everywhere. And trusteeship everywhere demands guardian alertness and the devotion that is packed into the word "fidelity." Listen to St. Paul as he writes to the young minister, Timothy: "O Timothy, guard that which hath been committed unto thee," or, as the margin of the Revised Version has it, "guard the deposit." There we have the very phraseology of the modern financial world on the New Testament page. Timothy and the trust companies are alike in this, that both are trustees. Both have had certain values, certain interests, turned over to them; in the one case it is monetary, and in the other it is spiritual. In other words, the character of the deposit differs, but the fact of a deposit remains.

Now this is precisely what Christ is talking about in the Parable of the Talents. He is saying that God, whom He portrays as the householder, gives to men certain values, or interests, of a spiritual character, to be held in trust for Him by them, to be used with a view to their increase, and to be accounted for by them when

He comes to make a reckoning with them. He is saying that God never makes grants to men. He makes loans. And the loans bear interest. God never lets anything completely out of His hands. He is a divine "depositor." And He will one day come to draw out what He has deposited, together with accrued interest, and woe to the trustee who fails on the interest.

As to the seriousness of any failure in caring for a trust, it is quite significant that the word we use for such failure in the business world is an ugly word. If an individual or an institution fails in taking care of a trust, we say the trust has been "betrayed." That word has the lampblack of treason all through it. It is suggestive of Judas Iscariot. The fact is, that the business world also casts faithless trustees out into outer darkness. Faithless lawyers are disbarred, and defaulting agents are put into the darkness of prison cells. And in the Kingdom of God it is no different, for there too the faithless trustee who has betrayed the trust the Lord gave into his hands is removed from the position and privileges which he might have enjoyed had he done differently. We talk volubly of stewardship, little realizing often what vast responsibilities are involved in the relationship. Eternity hinges on it. It sets our feet on the path to Heaven or hell. The universe is against the unfaithful. There is no place of escape. The law is inexorable. The parable of the talents is wrought out of cosmic stuff. It is universal law formulated in human speech. Thus the fact of trusteeship and the tremendously heavy responsibility attaching thereto are deeply embedded in our Lord's words in this parable.

But it is to neither of these immeasurably important features of the parable that this article proposes to give extended consideration. It is the identification of the

“goods” delivered by the householder to the servants that will engage our attention. We shall attempt to determine the precise character of the “talents” referred to by Christ. And surely the importance of a correct interpretation of this particular feature cannot be over-estimated, for unless we know what our talent is we shall be but poorly prepared to trade with it knowingly and profitably. We should be fully informed as to just what it is the Lord has committed to us as a trust, in order that we may with due discernment keep track of it and concentrate our attention and energies on its proper use, and so have a creditable showing when He returns to make a reckoning with us.

It need scarcely be said that this identification of the talents should be sought nowhere else than on the pages of the New Testament. In other words, it is not a matter of opinion to be decided by each individual for himself or to be submitted to a vote. In the case of the parable of the sower and tares the disciples sought Christ’s own interpretation of the elements composing the picture, and He in turn gave the interpretation with great fulness and precision of detail. How fortunate it would have been for succeeding generations of Christians if the disciples had likewise besought the Lord to interpret the parable of the talents! But, in the absence of such an express statement of meaning from His lips, the task essayed by this article must be to gather together, from His own words and those of His apostles to whom the Spirit, according to Christ’s own prediction, brought the knowledge of the “many things” which He had to say to them, but which they were not at that time able to receive, those references which serve to give definition to what lay in the mind of Christ as He spoke of the householder’s “goods.”

The usual definition is in terms of the servant's time, strength, natural capacities of mind, possessions, and special privileges. And this definition has passed so completely into the popular mind that our very language bears evidence of it, in the word "talented." The mint in which the word was coined was in turn fashioned after the pattern of the popular conception of what constitutes the "talent" in our Lord's immortal parable. And so it comes to pass that a person who possesses an unusual voice for singing, or who is an exceptional public speaker, or who is brilliant intellectually, is supposed, on the testimony of our word "talented," to fit into our Lord's parable as one of the servants to whom the householder committed his goods, for he is a "talented" person. Frances Ridley Havergal's exquisite hymn, "Take my life and let it be consecrated Lord to Thee," fills up exactly this popular notion of what constitutes the Christian's talent. Now all that is included in Miss Havergal's noble list of things to be consecrated to the Lord is most necessary if we are to be well pleasing unto Him; this is clearly understood.

But is it not possible that it was something different from our time and our money and our strength and our natural capacities that Jesus Christ had in mind as He uttered the words of this parable which has been hung by the Spirit's hands on the walls of imagination and memory in unnumbered millions of lives which have been with Mary at the Great Teacher's feet and have enjoyed that good part which could never be taken from them?

And to begin, let us look somewhat narrowly at what it was which the householder gave to his servants. Here we are dealing directly with Christ's portrayal, and are therefore face to face with supreme authority.

It is quite obvious that what the householder gave was not time or strength or natural capacities, for his servants had these before he made his committal of goods to them. As he was about to leave home he gave them a certain amount of capital on which to do business. He gave them something they had not had in their possession before, and would not have had then if it had not been that he deposited it with them. It is true that the amount committed in each case was determined by the ability of the servant, but it is just as true that the ability was not the talent. According to the popular idea the man who was so capable that he received five talents, was a very "talented" fellow; but according to our Lord's idea he was not "talented" at all until his master conferred on him a large share of his goods.

We should remember also to whom Christ was talking when He spoke this parable. He was talking to His disciples, to men who had forsaken all to follow Him. He was not giving this picture to the generality of men and women. There is something, therefore, evangelically esoteric about it. In other words this parable is for initiated souls, for those who have come apart with Christ and have confessed His name and professed their willingness to labor for the advancement of His Kingdom. The boundaries of it are not those of nature, but of grace. It is a Christian parable. To be sure, when we say this we are not thinking of that primitive revelation which God gave to all men and to which reference is made by Paul in the early chapters of his Epistle to the Romans. That revelation did doubtless involve something of what we believe our Lord had in mind when He pictured the master turning over to his servants his goods. But it is not this margin of spiritual endowment with which we are concerned now. The

rather we would find out for ourselves, as those to whom Christ has been fully revealed through the Gospel, what it is He has left us and for which we shall give an account at the last.

Following out the analogy in the parable, let us say emphatically that our "talent" is something Christ Himself has given us, something we should not have possessed if He had not brought it to us and committed it to our care. It is something which has come, not as a result of creation out of the dust of the earth, but as a result of re-creation in the new birth at the hands of God's Son our Saviour. It is something also which constitutes His chief concern, which makes up His "riches," just as the goods of the householder made up his riches. Now let us trace through the pages of the New Testament to see whether or not we can discover some of the elements which go to make up the "goods" of the kingdom of grace. In considering these elements the sequence is of less importance than the inclusion. We shall begin the list, therefore, with that which is most objective and tangible.

1. *The Words of Christ.* The words which fell from His lips are a part of the "goods" He has left with His disciples for safe-keeping and increase. Turn to John 17:8 and hear Him saying to His Father, "The words which thou gavest me, I have given unto them." Does that not sound strangely like the language of the parable of the talents? Or look at John 15:3, "Already ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you." There it is the mighty power of His word to cleanse the life. Then there is John 6:63, "The words that I speak unto you are spirit and are life." That is, His words bring the Holy Spirit and eternal life with them when they come into any man's heart.

John 12:48 brings us Christ's estimate of the judicial character and function of His words, "The word that I spake, the same shall judge him at the last day." The "goods" judged the servants at their day of reckoning, for weal or for woe, and Christ says His word will likewise judge us. He has left these living, cleansing, quickening, Spirit-laden, judgment-involving words to His followers in trust, and we must put them out to the bankers, so that when He comes back the word He gave to the Twelve shall have spread into millions of hearts. Every translator, every colporter, every Bible Society, every saint poring over the pages of his Bible, every Christian witness telling others of the teachings of his Lord, is putting his talent out at interest. Moody used to say there are these several things which we should ever be doing with the Word of God: Admit, commit, submit, transmit. That is we should admit it to our mind through diligent reading and study of it, then we should commit it to memory, so that we can carry it wherever we go, after that we should submit our lives to its teachings, and, lastly, we should transmit it to others. Dwight L. Moody was a faithful servant with his talent of the Word, and so will every person be who follows his advice and his splendid example.

Doubtless some have a greater capacity for the words of Christ than others. It may be a difference in intellectual power, but it is far more likely to be a difference in spiritual appreciation. The late Sir Robertson Nicoll said that only the saints can read the New Testament. It may be some humble, obscure disciple who knows the Lord by a rich experience of grace, or it may be some consecrated herald of the Gospel whose name is known, like Spurgeon's, to the ends of the earth. How diligently did a man like Bunyan traffic with his Re-

deemer's words, both in dealing with his own soul and in dealing with the souls of others; and that not only while he was at liberty, but also far more when he lay in Bedford jail and made a pulpit there from which he has been ever since piling up interest on those words through his *Grace Abounding* and his *Pilgrim's Progress*. What a great day it will be for Bunyan and his Saviour when he comes to turn back his talent of the Lord's words with what it earned at his diligent hand.

And the man with the one talent and his napkin and unused opportunities is not hard to find. Is he not all about us? How about the man or woman who was taught Christ's words in infancy and childhood in the home or in Sunday School, and then has gone out into the world and wholly neglected any further reading of the Bible and lost interest in it altogether? Surely in such a case the talent has been buried and there is no increase. And in such a life the loss of the original deposit is all the while going on, as the meaning and power of the Word grow less and less as the careless years come and go.

2. *The Love of Christ.* Lying behind His words and reflected in them there are certain mighty forces of the heart of Christ which He has brought to His disciples and has committed to them as a sacred trust to be used by them for their own enrichment of soul and for the salvation of those about them. And first among these let us name His love. He insisted that His followers should abide in His love. It was to be the climate they were to live in. They were to be environed by it continually. "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." Paul never could get over the immeasurable love of Christ to sinners. He says that scarcely for a righteous man

would one die, but that for a good man, who is both righteous and winsome, some would even dare to die; and then he goes on to marvel at the love of God that sent Christ to die for sinners. Writing to the Galatians, he declares that the first element in the fruit of the Spirit is love.

There it stands before us, a divine endowment, something communicated to us by the Holy Spirit, whom the Father and the Son have sent to be our helper. And who will say that this love is not to be used to the uttermost by every recipient of it, to be put out to the exchangers for increase in many hearts. "Keep yourselves in the love of God," says Jude. And whosoever does this is trading with his portion of his Lord's goods, for the more we keep our hearts in God's love the more that love fills every part of our being, until it becomes something far greater to us than it was at the first. We are also to carry this tender love of Christ out into loveless lives around us in the world, that it may find lodgment there and grow with use. How often we fail to win others to our Saviour because we do not manifest a real love for them! He whose talent of Christ-love is buried in a napkin will have no power to attract men to his faith.

Nowhere is the blessed traffic in the love of Christ more in evidence than down in the rescue missions where the wrecks of humanity drift in on the tide of misery and want. There some Jerry McAuley or Sam Hadley or John Wyburn pours his talent of the Redeemer's love into those poor, darkened, dissipated lives, and through its healing influence they are restored to God, to their families, and their own self-respect. Listen to the testimony of such in after days and conjure up in your mind the interest that has been earned on the love

which Christ entrusted to these devoted servants of His. But those who hinder the working of His love within their own hearts or in needy hearts about them, will straightway suffer the gradual withdrawal of the talent, and find themselves more and more in the outer darkness of lovelessness.

3. *The Joy of Christ.* "That my joy might be in you," says Christ, and then adds, "and that your joy may be made full." There again we have almost the phraseology of the parable of talents. Paul says the second element in the fruit of the Spirit is joy. Christ intends that we shall revel in His divine joy, until our joy simply runs over. It is His intention that His disciples shall trade with the joy He has left with them. That means that they are to live in it and pass it on to others. No true Christian will ever be a "kill-joy." The Christian Endeavor World was working near the center of truth some years ago when it had a column, edited by Mr. O. B. Joyful, who was pictured with a winsome face wreathed in smiles.

Spurgeon once said that many Christians seem to read the Apostle's words, "Rejoice in the Lord always, and again I say, Rejoice," on this fashion: 'Groan in the Lord always, and again I say, Groan.' A long-faced, sour-visaged Christian is a contradiction in terms. If we are gloomy and forbidding, it is because the initial joy our Saviour brought us has been wrapped up in a napkin and buried in the earth. A ripened saint said once to the writer, "May you always get the comfort out of your religion." No wonder men named this man Everlasting Sunshine Williams, for he was an eager trafficker in joy, the joy of his Lord.

4. *The Peace of Christ.* "My peace I give unto you," were His words to His disciples before He left

them to go to His Father. How much they sound like the words, "and delivered unto them his goods." Paul again names peace as the third element in the fruit of the Spirit. It is a state of heart, deeper than joy, and quieter. It is the absence of strain when the heart is in perfect articulation with the will of God, when the cogs of the disciple's desires and purposes mesh with those of the Lord. It was in this highest sense that Christ came to be a peacemaker. He came to make peace between a holy God and sinful men, and He did it by taking away the sin of the world. "Being, therefore, justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

And this peace is a part of the talent given over to our trusteeship. That trusteeship demands that we become evangelical peacemakers, bringing peace to men through justification. Thus will this peace spread and increase until the day when the Redeemer returns.

5. *Eternal Life.* This is, perhaps, in the nature of a summing up of the love and the joy and the peace of which we have been taking account. At any rate, the restatement will bring our talent to us with added clearness and fulness. Christ's phraseology lends itself admirably to our purpose here. "I came that they might have life, and that they might have it abundantly." It was this portion of the Saviour's goods that Bunyan's Pilgrim cried out after as he stood outside the City of Destruction with a book in his hand and a great burden on his back. "Life, life, eternal life!" he cried, as he set out on his journey toward the Celestial City. And it was just the persistent trading with his talent of eternal life that caused Pilgrim to increase more and more in the possession of it till his wondering eyes looked upon the glories of the City of God.

A noble galaxy of diligent servants who were among the bankers, by day and by night with their talent, fills the pages of the history of the church of Christ. There was Henry Martyn and David Brainerd and McCheyne and John G. Paton and Dan Crawford and a host of others who never wearied of trading with the eternal life their Lord committed to their care. "Good and faithful" will be the word they will hear from the lips of the Son of God when He comes to make a reckoning with them.

6. *His Own Living Presence.* He gave Himself for us; He also gives Himself to us. In John 14:23 He declares that He and the Father will make their abode with whosoever loves Him and keeps His word. In Revelation 3:20 He is seen standing at the door of the heart, knocking and promising to come in wherever His voice is heard and the door is opened. Paul says of himself, "Christ liveth in me." To others he says, "Christ in you the hope of glory." When we speak of this living presence of Christ as entering into the talents committed to Christians, we do so with the awareness that He is all-inclusive, giving vitality and worth to His words, and forming the spring from which issues perennially love, joy, peace, and eternal life. Harnack speaks truly when he avers that Christianity is Christ. He is the Alpha and Omega of it all.

So that what is now said is not by way of addition to what forms the disciple's talent, but by way of tracing the elements we have already remarked back to their living source. Let us repeat it then, that Christ commits His own spiritual presence to His followers to be used for their growth in grace and for the growth and expansion of His Kingdom. He is Himself the "deposit" in its last analysis. "I will come to you." The

apostles lived daily in the strength of this assurance. Paul said he was, even in the very midst of persecution, nakedness, peril, and sword, more than a conqueror through Him who loved him. Nothing is so characteristic of the early Christians as just this constant consciousness that Christ was in them, supporting them and working through them. The Apostle to the Gentiles was representative of many others about him when he wrote to the Philippians: "Yea verily, and I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but refuse, that I may gain Christ, and be found in him . . . that I may know him and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings." And, forgetting the things which were behind, he kept stretching forward and pressing on toward the goal in Christ. What is all this but Paul's eager trading with the spiritual bankers that he might have more and more of Christ within him?

When we reflect on the means by which we may build up an increment of Christ in our lives, we discover that they are the very means our fathers have used before us. The reading and pondering of the Word, the place of secret communion in prayer, the path of obedience to His known will—these are the time-tested, time-approved means. Several years ago at Stony Brook Dr. Ottman announced the beautiful hymn, *Take Time to be Holy*, and he asked the audience to substitute the phrase, "behold Him," for the phrase, "be holy," wherever it occurred. It was tremendously effective:

Take time to behold Him,
Speak oft with thy Lord.

But our point now is, that whenever we do this we

are adding to our talent against the day of His coming. And as for obedience, especially in the matter of going out to make disciples for Him, we have His own explicit pledge, that whensoever any of His followers do this He will be with them always, even unto the end of the age. Indeed, herein lies the explanation of the universal experience of spiritual satisfaction among consecrated missionaries of the cross. Their talent of the presence of Christ is abounding more and more as they go forward with their work in obedience to His blessed will. Herein also lies the explanation of the spiritual enrichment of churches that are truly missionary in spirit and deed. It is the parable of the talents being steadily enacted day by day and week by week.

All those who put their inner possession of Christ out to the exchangers, find 2 Corinthians 3:18 coming true in their experience. Ponder carefully Paul's formulation of the law, for it is a marvelous statement of the process implied in our Lord's parable which we are considering: "But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit." I think it is Drummond who in one of his matchless essays, writing on this verse, suggests that it may be read with new meaning if the word "character" is substituted for the word "glory." Gazing stedfastly on the character of Christ brings increasing likeness to that character, until at the last John's entrancing prediction comes true and we are found to be "like him, for we shall see him as he is." This means that the two or the five talents of Christ's spiritual presence have grown to be four or ten. And whether we phrase the result in Christ's terms in the parable, "Well done, good and faithful servant: . . . enter thou

into the joy of thy lord," or in John's statement of complete likeness to the glorified Redeemer in that day, it is all the same in fact. The reward has come, and it consists in perfect participation with the Lord Jesus Christ in His character and joy.

This then is the general line of interpretation of what constitutes the "goods" or "talent" in our Lord's great parable. It has been brought out in this article in a very brief and fragmentary manner, but, it is hoped, with sufficient fulness to enable any who care to do so to pursue the study still further. Nor has the writer any disposition to be arbitrary in fixing upon this general interpretation. Nevertheless, he is deeply convinced in his own mind that both the language and the logic of the New Testament confirm the definitive line set forth here. And not only so, but the confirmatory voice of human experience is loud and distinct. Indeed, one of the most powerful reactions to this reading of the parable is the overwhelming sense of its amazing conformity to the lives of men and women as they are being lived all around us. There comes anew the discovery that the words of Christ are nothing less than syllable-ized law, universal and inescapable in its operation.

SOME RECENT CRITICISMS OF FOREIGN MISSIONS

By ROBERT E. SPEER, D.D., Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America

FOREIGN MISSIONARIES and the foreign missionary enterprise have no title to exemption from criticism. And no such exemption is allowed them today. No doubt the criticism of all such movements and their agents is undulatory; at times the wave rises high and at times it drops down. Of late it seems to have risen. Illustrative expressions have been several articles in *The Atlantic Monthly*, especially Mr. Mark M. Jones' *A Missionary Audit*, in the issue of December, 1927, and Mr. Moore Bennett's *Christianity in China*, in the issue of August, 1928. The religious press also has been represented by a series of articles in *The Christian Century* dealing especially with China and *The Debacle of Missions in China*, and implying often the worldwide application of the writer's conceptions of missionary work in China, and quite apart from China finding a great deal requiring to be changed in the whole enterprise. This series has presented such titles as *New Wine Bursts the Old Missionary Bottles* (Feb. 19, 1925), *Again—"The End of Foreign Missions"* (Feb. 11, 1926), *Instead of Foreign Missions* (Feb. 18, 1926), *Why Young Missionaries Quit* (July 19, 1928), etc. These typical articles in two periodicals are illustrative. It would be easy to cite many others.

Many friends and adversaries, alike, of foreign missions have the impression that this wave of missionary

criticism is higher and more significant now than ever. Whether it is more significant depends, of course, on one thing only, namely, whether it is more true. If it is finding and disclosing shortcomings or mistakes, or false and unworthy elements, even though they be conscientious, it will be in just the measure of such discovery and disclosure, both significant and wholesome.

But one question is as to whether this present day criticism is more intelligent and discerning than the old. It is certainly an error in the sense of proportion to think that it is more extreme and outspoken than in former days. Anyone whose memory of missionary and anti-missionary literature reaches over a generation and whose knowledge of it goes back to the beginning of modern missions could readily produce the evidence that would set the present tide of criticism in its true proportion. I shall refer only to what is in one's own memory. Just as my own connection with the missionary enterprise began, a generation ago, a flood of critical or antagonistic discussions poured out from travelers like Curzon and Norman; from that most intelligent and trenchant student of missions in China, Alexander Michie of the Tientsin Press, in *Missionaries in China*, and *China and Christianity*; from statesmen like Lord Salisbury and John Sherman; from newspapers like *The New York Times*, in the West, in articles by Sydney Brookes, and *The Allahabad Pioneer* in the East, in India; from the new syncretism springing from the first approaches to the study of comparative religion; and from many other sources on the platform and in publications. Some of the critics ingeniously posed as nationals of the mission fields and Lowes Dickinson wrote his very clever *Letters from a Chinese Official*, and Mr. R. F. Johnston, as Liu Shao Yang, appealed as a

Chinese against Christian missions, with no intimation whatever of his deception. Much of the criticism was from people who did not believe in the missionary idea at all, and some of it was from those who did not believe in Christianity. But the two most effective critics were both Christians—Dr. R. N. Cust and Mr. Meredith Townsend.

Mr. Townsend was for many years editor of *The Friend of India*, in Calcutta, in succession to Dr. George Smith, and later followed Richard Holt Hutton as editor of *The Spectator*. His articles for years were among the most penetrating and philosophical of all contemporary discussions of the impact of Christianity on the Asiatic peoples. He was one who believed that Christianity had a missionary duty, but he despaired of its being able to fulfill it. Dr. Cust described himself on the title page of one of his books, *Essay on the Prevailing Methods of the Evangelization of the Non-Christian World*, as “an observer in the field, a member of committees, an all-round reader of missionary literature in five European languages, and one, whose heart and intellect, have been devoted to the subject for fifty years, independent of church, denomination, or nationality.” Dr. Cust was in the British service in India in the glow and high-mindedness of the Punjab group headed by the Lawrences, Edwardes, Montgomery, MacLeod, and others like them. On returning to England he became a member of the committee of the Church Missionary Society. He published a series of books on missionary subjects in which with unsparing criticism he set forth his condemnation of all of which he disapproved in the ideals or methods of missionaries and missionary organizations.

What the foreign mission enterprise is meeting today

in the way of criticism is often childish and much of it woefully amateurish in comparison with what it met thirty years and more ago. The Indian Mutiny in India and the Taiping Rebellion in China, in the middle of the last century, and the Boxer Uprising, as the new century began, brought with them and left behind them far more attacks upon foreign missions than have followed the present Chinese rebellion and what it was left for a Christian periodical to call "the missionary debacle." It has, however, nothing to do with the truth or falsehood, the good or the evil, of present day criticism to call attention to the fact that it is not new and that it falls far short of the older criticism in virulence and power, and those missionary folk who are frightened by it ought to turn their fears upon their own conceptions of the ground and ideal and true power of the missionary enterprise, all of which need fresh consideration, while some need reconsideration, and some call for solidification at the very points where current criticism would disapprove them.

Present criticism in the main is very different from the old. The newspaper comment, for example, is much more intelligent and appreciative than it used to be, in part because of a true appreciation of the purpose of missions and in part through new conceptions of their social and political bearings. And here one may note what will call for later comment, namely, the opposite views which critics take. Some newspapers commend missions for what they conceive to be their relationship to Western civilization and others condemn them for the same conception. Much of the criticism of the past denied the right of Christianity to invade the area of other religions, and much of it derided the missionary and his idea. There is still some of this, but the few

articles which have been mentioned as illustrative are illustrative also in this, that they do not in the most part question the validity of the foreign mission idea. They call rather for change of method or organization or spirit or personnel.

It is always a question how far it is worth while to answer irresponsible criticism. Men secure publication of articles, often for pay, who have made no adequate study of the things which they criticize, or who have themselves no stake or share in the undertaking. Other people are believing in it and making sacrifices for it, but the critic may be doing neither, and intending to do nothing, no matter what changes may be made. A man may leave the mission field and criticize those who remain for living exactly as he had lived while there and for pursuing methods which he himself had pursued. Since leaving the field he has come to believe that different methods would be better, but he did not adopt them when he had a chance, and he does not demonstrate them now. Or the critic may have an idea of the foreign mission undertaking which can easily be written up for publication, but which would never have produced the undertaking and would not sustain it today. It would yield neither the lives nor the support. These spring from the great consecrations which afford material for criticism, but not from a criticism which begets no great consecration. As a rule probably it is best to let the critics go their way. Now and then a falsehood will need to be dealt with or an injustice, which those who are themselves wronged would endure, needs to be called by its right name. But where criticism has an honest purpose, or even where it has not, the profitable course is to look at it and ask whether there is truth in it.

Indeed, the foreign mission enterprise criticizes it-

self far more within than it is criticized without. There could be made with little difficulty a list of reports, books, and articles by missionaries and missionary administrators which deal far more radically and intelligently with the problems of missions than the critics have done from without. No one ever dealt more vigorously with the problem of the relation of missions and education than Rufus Anderson, or of missions and subsidies than John L. Nevius, or of missions and economics than A. G. Jones, or of missions and governments than R. N. Cust, or of missions and society than J. C. Gibson, or of missions and national character than Guido Verbeck and Samuel A. Barnett, or of missionary administration than S. J. Clark. The foreign mission movement is full of shortcomings. It must inevitably be. Its central idea becomes confused. The great religious and theological convictions back of it become relaxed or distorted. Its best agents realize most their inadequacy. And all of its agents are not best. But so far as it is genuine and true it will go on, and criticism will help it and not hurt it. It will winnow and clarify, and while it may cut down the volume of support, especially the unjustified criticism that goes on within the church and among the Christian people who ought to be supporting missions, all this will be beneficial. Foreign missions have always been a small minority cause and will continue so. The worthwhile causes live by their worthwhileness, not by majority commendation.

The central questions concern, first, their fundamental worthwhileness, and, second, their general process and particular methods. As to the first point, the essential problem is simply the nature and worth of the Christian religion or, as we would rather say, of Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour. There are those

who object to the claim of Christianity, that Christ is unique, universal, and final. The foreign mission enterprise rests on this claim. But, even when this is nominally conceded, or where it is admitted that Christianity is the superior religion, it was formerly agreed that foreign missions were wrong because they were presenting Christianity apart from and before the arrival of Western civilization. Modern criticisms, on the contrary, attack foreign missions for too great implication of relationship with Western civilization. Indeed, the same critics today will complain of foreign missions on wholly opposite grounds, on one side because it is too much mixed up with political and social ideals, and on the other side because it is not mixed up enough. The missionary must have nothing to do with government, either his own or that of the country to which he has gone, no relationship, as Cust held, "to the arm of the flesh." But the same critic will complain of the missionary because his message and mission are other-worldly and not sufficiently dynamic and upheaving in their political and social consequence. The critics demand that foreign missions must be at one and the same time both social and non-social.

It is this very demand for opposites, this contradictoryness of criticism, which makes it impossible to satisfy the critics. What one requires another repudiates. In China, for example, the Protestant missionaries are criticized both for too much and for too little sympathy with the nationalist movement, for too much and too little deference to the authority of their own home governments, for too much Modernism and too much Fundamentalism, for too much educational work and for not enough, for too much and too little identification with the commercial communities from the West,

for compromising tenderness toward China's old religions and ethical ideas and for ruthless condemnation of them. Individual missionaries may, indeed, be criticized on any one of these grounds, but they cannot be criticized for all of them, nor can the movement as a whole be held responsible for diametrically opposite positions. The critic ought to say that he is criticizing only particular persons, or he should prove that the charge he is making is true of the general body of missionaries and that the thing charged is wrong.

And what is true of China and of current criticism of missions in China is true of the whole undertaking. The critics annul each other. They demand that missions should be more simply evangelistic and more exclusively educational. They say that the native church is sycophantic and parasitical and also that it is in rebellion against the missionary and his continued tutelage. They declare that missionaries should be about their primary business and let social and economic issues alone; and at the same time they call for the concentration of missions on the industrial and material betterment of local and national conditions. They deride the statistical reports and the supposed demand by the boards and home churches for statistical results; yet they propose, nevertheless, a set of more rigid statistical requirements and the application of statistical tests to missionary service in lieu of "vague generalities about the spiritual results of missionary effort." They lament the lack of missionary sacrifice and the collection of missionaries in larger centers, and in the same breath condemn the single women missionaries who go off to live in the interior among the people. And such a list of contradictory demands could be lengthened indefinitely.

But the method of letting critics answer one another does not meet the queries with which the foreign mission enterprise ought always to be examining itself; and this brings us to the second point, covering general process and particular methods.

Like any human movement carried on by human agents it has its weakness. It makes errors as to fundamental principles. Sometimes wrong principles are followed. Sometimes right ones are discerned, but practice is not adequately ruled by them. Men and women blunder. Some of them are not as good as they ought to be, and the good are not always wise. Working ideas change, or the language which expresses the same idea changes from decade to decade. Conditions inevitably alter. Foreign missions are doing their best to alter them, and other forces are at work resistlessly. Methods must be modified to meet new situations. It is quite conceivable either that foreign missions have been over institutional or that they have not been institutional enough, or that a new time is near when they shall be made either much less or much more institutional than they have been. If governments restrict the educational and medical work of missions the result may be a great expansion of evangelistic work with a new type but a smaller number, or possibly even a larger number of men and women who will proclaim Christianity in new evangelistic ways.

Some of the recent criticism suggests constructively, that foreign mission work should be more fully consolidated in fewer denominations and missionary organizations, that missions should be carried on with greater continuity by a force with smaller overturn of personnel and with more specialized preparation and right of self-determination, that there should be more simplicity and

frugality of living and expenditure on the part of missionaries with more adaptation to the style of life of the people, that the authority and judgment of the national Christians should be more fully recognized and the responsibility of the movement more fully transferred to the field. Something may be said briefly on each of these points.

As to church consolidation on the foreign field, it is well known that organic denominational union has prevailed much further there than at home. In all mission fields, for example, with one minor exception, all the Presbyterian and Reformed missions from the West have united in establishing and maintaining one native church. Their policy from the beginning has been to encourage united national churches and not to perpetuate themselves. The threadbare joke about the "Chinese Dutch Reformed Church" is a sheer invention; there never was such a church. It is to be hoped that this movement for national unification will proceed. Meanwhile it is wise to see and speak the truth. There is no such hopeless confusion in China and Japan and elsewhere as the critics allege. The territory is divided. The number of Christian denominations is small. The "poor people" are not bewildered by them. Either they do not know the difference or they see it to be far less than they are accustomed to in their own familiar religious divisions. And the hindrance in the way of larger unions in these fields is not in most of the home boards. It is among the nationals themselves. Some of this is regrettable, but not all of it. The unity of the Roman Catholic Church is not a unity of such adequate reality as to suggest that any unity whatever is desirable just for the sake of unity. And the trust idea, whether in the church abroad or in board unification at home, which is

in the mind of some critics, the idea of big business consolidation, is not a wholly one-sided proposition. There is now more co-operation and common action in foreign missions than in any other religious service, and there ought to be still more of it, but there are other values involved than those which the mathematical efficiency expert takes into account. Overhead charges in the home administration ought to be reduced; but as a matter of fact the excess is not in administration. It is in promotion and the effort to secure added support, and in this respect each board carries on a conflict between the economists who would cut down and the business element which believes in advertising and in spending money to get more to spend on the work. There ought to be more church unity and more economy, but the practical question is, how to effect them.

Something more explicit should be said regarding the criticism of the expense of foreign missionary administration and its use of the money given for the work. In reality no money begins to go as far as foreign missionary money. In medical work compare the cost of foreign missionary medical service with medical service in the United States. Let us take one American hospital and compare it with the expense and work of the 89 hospitals and 122 dispensaries maintained by the Presbyterian Board. Study the following table:

	One American Hospital	All Our Presbyterian Foreign Mission Hospitals and Dispensaries
Earnings	\$490,160	\$540,605
Other income	\$621,238	\$58,640
Operating expense ..	\$1,015,134	\$599,245
In patients	4,402	59,093
Out patients	29,810	441,139
Visits and treatments	113,113	1,155,657
Cost per patient.....	\$34	\$1.36
Cost per visit.....	\$8.97	.52

And if we consider only the money given, and not the earnings, the difference becomes more amazing. The money received by this one American hospital from endowment and as donations was \$621,238. The total given for the 89 mission hospitals was \$58,640. Each dollar at home provided for less than one-twentieth of a patient. Or, to put it otherwise, it took \$21 of benevolent gifts to care for one patient. Abroad each dollar given by the church in the United States provided for 75 patients. It would have required nearly a fourth of the Board's total expenditure to provide for the medical work on the scale of cost of this one home hospital. What it required a million dollars to do at home, the Board did abroad with less than sixty thousand. And yet foreign missions are called extravagant or inefficient!

This was a great city hospital, but not as great in its work as some single foreign mission hospitals. But any country hospital in America could be taken for illustration also. One in a New Jersey town cost last year \$323,819 and treated 18,332 patients in clinic and in patient work, or at the rate of \$17 per patient as compared with \$1.36 abroad.

In the cost of educational work take this same New Jersey town and compare costs there with our foreign mission schools. The number of children in school in this town was 3,314, and the annual cost, \$395,147, or \$119 per pupil, for the year. In our Board's schools there were 110,653 pupils at a cost of \$546,972 plus the salaries of foreign missionaries engaged in educational work which might be estimated at \$500,000, making an average cost per pupil of \$9; and remember that in the American town cited the schools run only through high

school, while our foreign mission schools include colleges, universities, and graduate schools.

The Board might have spent its whole outlay of \$4,903,847 last year on its hospitals alone, and the expense per patient would have been \$11 or less than one-third that of the city hospital cited. It might have spent its total outlay on its schools alone, and the expense per pupil would have been \$44 or about one-third of the cost per pupil in the typical town used for illustration. If the Board's medical and educational work had cost as much as in these cases at home it would have cost \$13,167,707 for the medical, and \$14,998,726 for the educational, or \$28,166,433 instead of what it actually did cost, namely, \$1,105,612. Where has money been used more economically and effectively?

But it is said the overhead for administration and promotion is excessive. "It costs a dollar to send a dollar" is the old canard. And some go even further and say that a still smaller per cent. than one-half of the money given ever reaches the field. Well, what are the facts? I wrote them recently in answer to an honest inquiry as follows:

It is a pleasure to answer your letter of inquiry with regard to the cost of administration of our foreign missionary work.

Our total receipts in the United States last year were \$4,696,966.00. The cost of administration was \$191,229.00 or about 4%. The heavy item in overhead charges is not administration but collection and promotion—the supply of literature to the Churches and the work of secretaries of the Board and of the General Council in maintaining and increasing the interest in the home Church. The total amount of such expenditures, including interest on borrowed funds necessitated by the churches' delay in sending in their contributions (\$10,846.00) and our Board's share of the expenses of the General Council, ordered by the General Assembly, (\$115,182.00) was \$469,000.00, or about 10%.

In addition to the receipts from the home churches in

America, however, the Board received for the work nearly \$2,000,000.00 in fees, contributions, etc., from the churches, hospitals and schools on the Mission field. Inasmuch as all this was part of the money administered, it ought to be included in estimating the percentages and would reduce all of the percentages which I have given above by one-third.

No one can feel more strongly than some of us do who have given our lives to the Foreign Missionary enterprise that the cost of promotion and administration should be reduced to the lowest possible figure. For years in our Board we held the total figure of expenditure of promotion and administration combined to less than 5% so that any one desiring to send a dollar to the mission field could do it far more cheaply through the foreign Board than by attempting to send it independently. He would, moreover, receive an accounting of the expenditure of his money and be assured of its conscientious administration. I wish that we could get back to this lower ratio and I hope that some day we can.

The impression that the losses and withdrawals in foreign missions are excessive and that they are much larger now than in former days is of doubtful validity. It may be sound in the case of some denominations and some fields, but I cannot find that it is justified by the facts which have been gathered in the case of the Presbyterian Board. Outside of death the losses from resignation and withdrawal, largely for health reasons, are less than 4 per cent. of the missionary staff. By way of comparison, one of the greatest New York banks reports 17 per cent., one of the greatest life insurance societies 16 per cent., one of our greatest school faculties 10 per cent., an important steel industry 30 to 100 per cent., and in the dry goods organizations generally from 25 to 100 per cent. I submitted the facts to one of the best actuaries in the country and he replied:

A leaving rate of less than 4% per annum is amazingly good, standing by itself. When it is remembered that a very large proportion of your staff consists of married persons and that in the case of such you have two resignations where you

would otherwise have only one, it will be seen that the above figure, small as it is, is really inflated. I have no doubt that a study of the cause of resignation would be found reassuring.

I find from the data which you sent me last December that the average term of service of those who resigned was a little over 10 years for both men and women combined. For men alone it was a little over 11 years, and for women alone it was a little under ten years. Without having any definite information, I have an idea that these figures will compare favorably with the average pastorate in this country, without making any allowance for the difficulty which churches sometimes experience in getting rid of the poor sticks that are at times thrust upon them.

I am afraid that the member of your board who expressed amazement at your turnover is not cognizant of what is occurring in business offices generally. The facts are a wonderful tribute to your organization.

But the tribute is to the service, not to the organization. And looking back over the past we have been unable to verify the impression that the overturn is greater now than it used to be. Perhaps this is due in part to the combined effort of our Board and its missions, while using short term workers, to adhere to the idea of life service. It has been the upheaval in China which accounts for large withdrawal the past year. But this is not a new thing. In the eighties there was a withdrawal of missionaries from Japan proportionately more serious. It began with the idea that the Japanese church did not need more foreign missionaries and that their work was done, and it ended in the reaction in Japan against foreigners which led many foreign missionaries to think that there was no more place for them. And all this passed away so completely in Japan that young missionaries do not have it in their mind at all.

Undoubtedly there are losses due to the fact that young missionaries are disappointed in not finding the special work which they wanted to do. And these will

continue, all the more perhaps if the ideal of one writer prevails: "A young person goes to the field full of hopes and energy. He wants to jump right into his task and get results. He should be encouraged to do so. In every other calling it is so; the hustler gets the prize; even in business in the so-called mission lands it is so." The young missionary who does this without waiting to learn the language will probably feel shortly that he has made his contribution and will leave soon. And also he may find the situation more difficult as the native leaders take over direction and treat his specialized vocation less considerately than his missionary associates had done. There is assuredly a problem here ahead of foreign missions. Will the cause be able to secure and retain the same type of broad power and tenacious and adaptive personality which it has held in the past, or will young men who studied high school pedagogy or rural sociology be unwilling to continue in the work except in the fixed specialization of their student days? It would seem clear that in the transition from mission control to church administration men and women will be needed of large capacity for adaptation and adjustment, who will set ends above means and who will be ready to serve where service is needed most.

The criticism of foreign missionaries for their scale and expense of living is both old and difficult. The effort of mission boards has been to provide a comfortable living salary that would relieve the mind of the missionary of any anxiety or care and leave him free to devote himself wholly to his work. It is believed that unmarried foreign missionaries, and foreign missionaries married but without children, have been thus cared for by their church boards. The pressure has been on missionary families with children to educate. To meet their

problems special schools have been supplied and increasing grants in the way of children's allowances have been made, but these fall far short of furnishing the educational cost when the children leave home or return to America for high school and college. The boards have not been able nor felt it their duty to do more. But the present criticism is against their doing as much as they are doing. A young missionary writer from Japan deals with this:

The young worker finds the missionaries with whom he must work living on such a high standard of living as effectively to divorce themselves from the lives of those among whom they seek to do good. And it ought to be said, too, that the average missionary lives better on the field than all but the highest-salaried ministers at home. Now this is not altogether the fault of those now in missionary service. It is partly because when missions first came to these countries, land and labor and all material things were so cheap that large mission grounds were purchased as centers of work, huge houses were built, and a corresponding scale of living was adopted. Today the missionary, much as he would like to reduce his living expenses, finds himself forced to live in these grand but now decaying old establishments, with all the upkeep expenses they involve and the necessity of keeping enough servants to care for them.

All this is wrong, not only in that it is a dreadful burden and keeps us from intimate relations with the common people who naturally 've a suspicion of luxury, but also because living in such a style, with native servants to wait on us and being able on our foreign salaries to enjoy things which only the wealthiest natives can afford, inevitably creates in the missionary's mind a superiority complex which he would not otherwise have. Indeed, one wonders if such conditions are not largely responsible for that certain lassitude and dependence upon the services of others which even the young missionary soon begins to develop, if not ever on the alert.

And a writer in *The Atlantic Monthly* for August, 1928, charges that the Protestant missionaries in China are better paid than foreign business men—which is incredible, live in better houses, have summer residences,

and know no such hardship and show no such consecration as the Roman Catholic missionaries.

Well, what are the salaries which foreign missionaries receive? In India Presbyterian unmarried missionaries receive \$1128-1175; married missionaries, \$1884-1968. In Japan unmarried missionaries receive \$1125; married missionaries, \$2250. In China our unmarried missionaries receive \$900-960; married missionaries, \$1680-1800. In addition house rent and medical care are provided and allowances for children ranging from \$200 to \$300 per child. Servants are cheaper in these lands than in America, but all other living expenses are becoming approximately even, and some are higher. Clearly there are no princely salaries here. And all are on one level together. When they come home to America the home salary on furlough ranges from \$1200 for an unmarried missionary to \$2100 for married, with the children's allowances continued the same as on the field, and with partial help in some boards for rent and medical bills. The average salary of Presbyterian ministers in the United States is \$2,500, inclusive of manse.

From the point of view of board administration all that can be said is, that the boards try to take honest and fair care of their missionaries. They do not believe that they are doing so on an extravagant basis. They do believe that homes should be simple but healthful. They do advocate as close relation to the people as possible. But the missionaries cannot live on the level either of the lowest or of the highest native life. The former is physically, and the latter economically, impossible. And today there are already some native Christian teachers and preachers who receive higher salaries than foreign missionaries.

Any fair and adequate comparison of Protestant and Roman Catholic missionaries in this and in other respects would be impracticable here. But it is not true that all the Roman Catholic missionaries remained at their stations and all the Protestants left. And it is of interest to note, that the critic in the August Atlantic sets the Roman Catholic missionaries above the Protestant, not only for frugality of living, but also for their aloofness from the new movements of national and social life in China. He and the Pope appear to be at variance on the subject. The Pope issued, on August 3, 1928, a message of sympathy and approval with the nationalist movement and government and urged the Roman Catholic missionaries in China to promote the aspirations and rights of the Chinese:

His Holiness recommends the Bishops as a complement to their work of evangelization, to organize and develop Catholic action in order that the Catholic faithful of both sexes, and especially the dear youth, may with prayer and good works contribute toward the peace, social well-being and greatness of their country in spreading the sacred and salutary principles of the gospel and in helping the Bishops and clergy to disseminate Christianity and the individual social benefits of Christian charity [New York Times, Aug. 4, 1928].

Lastly, foreign missions are criticized today for their reluctance to accord freedom to the national churches. A writer in The Outlook of February 10, 1926, expressed this view:

The tide of nationalism in China and India is now rising to the level of that of Japan. The inability of the foreign church boards and their representatives in Japan to reckon with the new Japanese nationalism during the final quarter of the last century set back the progress of Christianity and possibly prevented Japan from being the first nation of the orient to take this oriental religion back to an oriental habitat and make it the mighty national savior. It might still be were not the principles of Jesus so often flouted by Christian statesmen and

legislatures, ignored by business, and jettisoned by our mass wars.

This is the hour of greatest peril to Christianity in China, and of the greatest hope. Peril if we continue foreign control over any part of it, any of its personnel, its finance or its policies. We must set Christianity free. A new proclamation of emancipation. The national mind of China and India, as of Japan, spurns a foreign-controlled religion. Foreign-controlled institutions cannot hope to hold the allegiance of eastern peoples.

Now, it is worth recalling that it was Neesima who blocked the proposal for one church in Japan which might have taken over the enterprise with the co-operation of the churches abroad, and it is worth observing also that far deeper and graver issues were moving than could have been altered by any missionary policy. And it is worth declaring plainly that no missionary policy antagonizes the freedom of the national churches and of Christianity in any of these lands. On the contrary, missions and mission boards have striven and are striving almost to despair to get the churches to stand forth free and self-controlled, assuming and fulfilling their own responsibility.

The problem is one not of emotion, but of reality. Freedom is not a donation which can be given to a church. It is an achievement which only the church can attain. And missions and boards are, or ought to be—and to the extent that they are not they are justly open to criticism—ready and eager to transfer authority and responsibility and to recognize them as true elements and characteristics, to be longed for and welcomed in the churches of the mission field. But here again criticism wants to have its cake and eat it. It wants responsibility and power transferred, but it wants also “adequate accounting for results, proper and business-like procedure.” But we cannot recognize the freedom

and control of the nationals with one gesture and deny it with another. And there is no easy task here—to recognize their responsibility and not default in our own. What we want is the truth in action, a real Christian church in China and India and everywhere, carrying its own burden, facing its own national task with the best, truest, ablest help we can give, given in the most careful and generous way and under an administration of our trust as competent, efficient, unified, and economical, and as vital, personal, and spiritual, as can be in the hands of such poor folk as we.

NEW YORK.

CHURCH UNION IN CANADA

By S. D. CHOWN, D.D., LL.D.

THE UNION of the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational churches in Canada was not of mushroom growth. Before the beginning of the present century the spirit of comity and co-operation between the Methodist and Presbyterian denominations resulted in a policy of decision on the part of both these denominations not to send a representative of either into localities already occupied by the other church. This policy soon developed into one of still greater fraternity, that of withdrawing ministers of either denomination where both were at work, and leaving the field to the occupation of one only. By this method and by the independent action of many communities over three thousand local union congregations were organized before the great union of the three denominations took place on June 10, 1925.

A corollary of this scheme was the division for ecclesiastical colonization of the territories served by railways in unsettled portions of the country, so that competition might be avoided in advance as between the denominations which proposed later to become one body.

Official action looking specifically toward organic union was first instituted in the year 1902. A deputation from the former Presbyterian Church suggested the advisability of union to the Methodist General Conference meeting in Winnipeg that year. This led to the immediate appointment of the Methodist section of a joint committee to explore the possibility of such a consummation. In 1904 the then Presbyterian Assem-

bly took similar action, and in the autumn of that year negotiations began.

In 1906 the Anglicans and Baptists were requested by the joint committee, as then constituted of Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational representatives, to join in the movement.

The Anglicans in reply expressed a willingness to discuss the problems involved, providing as a condition precedent the Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888 were accepted, one article of which inferentially denied the full validity of ordination in the Free Churches, and consequently disparity of status on the part of their ministers. The joint committee of the negotiating churches felt that discussion could take place only upon equal terms, and that all questions should be thrown into the crucible of debate, and only that residuum adopted which approved itself as of constructive value in building the Kingdom of God.

The Baptists, through a committee appointed for that purpose, expressed a conviction that they must maintain a distinct organization to accomplish their particular task. The word "conviction" interposed a barrier to further discussion, because the union movement was not intended to convert the views of any section participating in it, but to discover whether a sufficient platform of truth and action could be agreed upon in good faith by all the parties thereto.

Reluctantly the framers of the Basis of Union for a United Church were compelled to move forward without the co-operation of the Christian brethren of these two great churches.

MOTIVES

The primary motive of the churches proposing to unite was to supersede as far as possible the fractional repre-

sentations of Christianity which different denominations had hitherto presented to the world, by an organization which by its confessed unity might reveal to mankind in larger measure some of the great spiritual realities inherent in the message of Christ but as yet not duly appreciated by His church. This motive was sustained by a belief that a divided church of Christ is a denial of one of the fundamental principles of His religion.

The unionists believed they were carried by the Spirit of God beyond regarding ecclesiastical divisions amongst Christians as merely unfortunate and inexpedient. To them they appeared unnecessary and even demonstrably wrong. They were deeply moved by the fact that in Canada the Christian church was faced with the task of Christianizing an immense unoccupied territory, to be populated shortly by millions of people of foreign birth. The churches proposing union believed that this task could not be effectively met except by the consolidation of their resources, and that to use the Lord's men and expend the Lord's money in perpetuating barriers between evangelical churches which were preaching the same Gospel was an improvidence amounting to sinful waste.

It was also felt by the high contracting parties as time wore on that they must, though the course was beset with many obstacles, keep faith with the people of the more than three thousand local union congregations, composed of persons who had temporarily surrendered their denominational affiliation upon the promise that they would be restored to the fellowship of their former co-religionists.

Looking in the direction of foreign missions, it was becoming very evident that the impact of the Gospel in distant parts of the world was seriously undermined by

denominational shibboleths, and that the native Christian leaders were determined to obliterate these distinctions and achieve union by the establishment of undivided churches. The native churches were saying, "Hitherto you have been sending to us the Gospel message through many separate channels—Low Church, High Church, Anglican, Baptist, Wesleyan, American Methodist, and half a dozen others. We know that was inevitable, but we don't mean to keep those channels separate any longer." One church said, "If within three years you cannot lead us into unity by your own unity at home, we shall achieve unity for ourselves, and leave you on one side" (quoted from an address by the Bishop of Liverpool). The recent Jerusalem Council, by its constitution, its spirit, and deliberations, was a striking confirmation of the existence of that spirit in Eastern lands. The United Church was an effort to meet that situation as far as it could be done in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, Bermuda, and in our distant mission fields.

These motives combined to produce in the minds of unionists an unshakable conviction that church union in Canada was according to the will of God, and that as trustees for posterity they must go forward with as little delay as possible.

RESULTS

The formation of the United Church of Canada was a great adventure of faith. It was the first time in history that three historic Protestant denominations had essayed such a task. The process required more wisdom and especially more religion than were anticipated during the free and joyous play of Christian sentiment in the early days of the movement. Notwithstanding divine guidance was sought at the starting point and at

every turn of the road, and was sincerely believed to have been obtained, human imperfections somehow intervened to prevent the complete realization of the magnificent dream cherished so hopefully at the beginning of the movement. However, it must in truth be said that, in view of all its relations to the Kingdom of God and the necessities of the vast country which it serves, the establishment of the United Church was not an ecclesiastical blunder, but on the contrary a blessed and impressive triumph of prophetic statesmanship.

That the readers of the *REVIEW* may glimpse the magnitude and importance of this movement, we give a few available statistics concerning certain aspects of the new church.

Its reported strength in membership in December, 1927, was 637,251, which showed an increase of 27,250 since the consummation of union. In 1927 it employed 3,695 ordained ministers and missionaries, who occupied 3,198 charges, with a total of about 7,500 preaching places.

In the foreign field 603 missionaries are now employed, while 268 missionaries and helpers minister to the needs of foreign speaking peoples in Canada. They preach the Gospel of the saving grace of God in 25 different languages to people gathered in from 68 different nations, and care for the sick in 26 hospitals sustained by the church. It is worthy of note that the proposal to unite the three denominations carried such conviction that the missionary staffs of the three uniting churches, numbering 655, all came into the union except 17 Presbyterian foreign missionaries (the latter including men and their wives, and single women). Also all the professors of eight theological colleges, with two Presbyterian exceptions, and all the secretaries, editors, and

other connexional officials, again with two Presbyterian exceptions, came into the United Church.

The United Church has 4,105 preaching places in home mission areas, so that the vast majority of immigrants to the Great West of Canada will find that it is the only church already at work in many localities where they may choose to settle.

The above figures will give the reader to realize something of the magnitude of the field and work of the United Church. The interest of the readers, however, will be chiefly centered upon the question as to how the union is working out. Is it fulfilling the purposes in view when it was achieved? Statistics can give but a partial answer to this question, but they have their own important significance.

Since the inauguration of the United Church of Canada in June, 1925, by rearrangement of fields union of charges has been effected to the number of 528, thereby forming for the most part strong and self-sustaining community churches. Thus the Presbytery of Kamloops, British Columbia, reports from this consolidation a net saving of \$2,750 per year, with vastly increased efficiency in carrying on the work. In 1925 the town of Grand Prairie, in the Peace River country, received a missionary grant of \$750. Today, without any assistance from the mission fund, it pays a salary of \$2,000 and has built a nine thousand dollar church. Such examples which might be quoted *ad libitum* are largely due to the union spirit.

Since the last meeting of the General Council (the supreme court of the church) in 1926, 375 fields have been taken off the list of aid-receiving charges, having reached the status of self-support; and within the same period 285 new fields have been opened up by the Home

Mission Board. These new fields are estimated to include 1,000 preaching points.

The union spirit also appears to have given a noteworthy impulse to church building. Since June, 1925, in Montreal 20 new churches have been built, and many more are planned for the immediate future. In Greater Toronto new churches or extensions to former buildings have been undertaken in 43 centers, including a Church of All Nations and another for the deaf. In Vancouver 15 new churches have either been completed or are in course of erection, and half as many more are already projected. Mortgages amounting to \$950,000 have been paid off by the church as a whole. The amount of outlay by the congregations of the United Church since the date of union represents a total of almost \$8,000,000.

In a word, the United Church is meeting the needs of the nation as they were never before met, and is in a position to render still more comprehensive service. Since the union the church has absorbed between four and five hundred ministers who, owing to union, were left without charges and is already preparing to increase the annual visible supply.

But of far more importance to the Christian world are the spiritual idealism and religious results which are being achieved. I will quote the testimony both from within and from outside the United Church.

From within it is said that, "The United Church is not merely an amalgamation; it is a real union of spirit." Through it we have entered a sacred fellowship, and it has been discovered that each denomination has added incalculably to the spiritual treasure of the others. The unity and enthusiasm which have superseded the old rivalries are proving irresistible. Ancient loyalties,

though deep rooted, have lost their compelling power in a stronger loyalty to the new church with its larger sphere of operations. The fellowship in service has obliterated denominational preferences as to earlier methods of work. Divergencies of judgment in transacting the business of the church have been shown to be traceable to psychological origins, and when they persist are found to be rooted in the habits of thought formed on account of working in different kinds of harness for many years, and coming to believe that the success of the past was due to the harness as much as to the strength put forth in using it.

But peculiarities of temperament and tradition germane in this country to Presbyterianism, Methodism or Congregationalism have been fused and sublimated by the intense heat of a pure Christian purpose. There is a fine loyalty and a delightful fellow-feeling in the ministry of the United Church. The writer is not aware of any meeting of a church court, board or united congregation where the house has divided upon denominational lines. The worthiness of the issue at stake has been the dominating force in the settlement of all debatable questions. This spirit might be illustrated by many examples.

For instance, in an annual conference a committee appointed to strike a committee to consider a certain matter of business proposed the appointment of a decided majority of Methodists. A former Methodist minister immediately arose in protest against so many Methodists being named, but a former Presbyterian shouted back over the heads of the conference that it was time these denominational divisions were forgotten—and it was so decreed. The best information available shows that 153 ministers during the past year have been

called or appointed to churches other than those of their former affiliations.

Testimony from the outside as to the success of union is equally decisive with that within the United Church. I will quote but one witness. The Rev. Leyton Richards, pastor of Carr's Lane Church, Birmingham, England (the illustrious pulpit successively occupied by Rev. R. W. Dale, D.D. and Dr. J. H. Jowett), writing recently from Toronto to *The Christian World*, of London, said: "I have just finished a tour of all the Conferences of the United Church, five in number in the Province of Ontario. My chief role has been that of an enquirer, and I came back from my visitation with the conviction that no single principle of any one of the uniting denominations has been sacrificed. Union, therefore, is not merely a logical unification, (validated as it is by Act of Parliament), but a great spiritual achievement, and as impressive as it is great. . . . Here and now in the Sherbourne Street United Church in Toronto I, a Congregationalist, am ministering to a one-time Methodist Church, whose present pastor is a former Presbyterian. Union works here and releases for spiritual advance efforts previously wasted in sectarian rivalry. Then why not in the Old Country?"

The conviction daily deepens in the United Church, that far more essential than union itself is the strengthening of character and the enrichment of the spiritual life of the ministers and people who compose the church. The new organization has not proven itself to be a dormitory filled with flowery beds of ease, but a workshop of immense proportions and unmeasured tasks. The prayer of an increasing number of believers for spiritual revival is being answered, and they are looking with faith and expectancy for times of refresh-

ing from the presence of the Lord. They believe that the United Church, having fulfilled the will of God by healing as far as in it lay the divisions in the body of Christ, has great reason to exercise implicit faith for continued and increasing blessing.

This paper would not be complete without the suggestion, in all humility, that the enlarged vision of ministers and people is having a reflex of influence in developing a truer type of Christian discipleship than the uniting churches formerly produced. The constant play of larger interests is having a marked effect in this direction.

For instance, in the field of foreign missions. Instead of being confined in their immediate interest to certain comparatively small portions of the globe, the thought, prayer, and sympathies of the membership range over all the continents of the earth. The United Church is ready to accept the implications of the recent Jerusalem Council in this new era of missionary responsibility.

The harmonious relation of the principles of this church to the Kingdom of God affords an opportunity for spiritual culture and expansion of sympathy such as the church of Christ has not known for centuries, and in some aspects such as the world has never seen. The ministers and members supporting this new adventure feel the call of God to the observance of the first principles and practices of early Christianity, and are under constraint to consecrate their lives thereto.

May I add that the United Church of Canada stands officially recognized as in affiliation with world-wide Methodism, with the Alliance of Reformed Churches throughout the world holding the Presbyterian system, and with the International Congregational Council.

TORONTO, CANADA.

LUTHER AND THE TURKISH INVASION OF WESTERN EUROPE

By W. H. T. DAU, President of Valparaiso University

ON APRIL 16, 1529, there was published by Hans Weiss at Wittenberg, Saxony, Luther's treatise *On War Against the Turks*.¹ Luther had begun to write this treatise on October 9 of the previous year. On February 13 the first forms of the treatise, already printed, had become lost through the negligence of the printer, and Luther had to rewrite their contents. Towards the end of 1529, after his return from the colloquy with Zwingli at Marburg, Luther published another treatise which he entitled *Campaign Sermon [or Army Sermon]* against the Turks.² A second edition of this treatise was sent by Luther to his friends on January 3, 1530.

What prompted these treatises? They were written partly in self-defense, partly from a patriotic motive.

In the bull of excommunication, *Easurge Domine*, which Pope Leo X had issued against Luther June 15, 1520, Luther's errors are enumerated. The thirty-fourth error which the Pope reprobated was this: *Proeliari adversus Turcas est repugnare Deo visitanti iniquitates nostras* (To make war upon the Turks means to fight against God who is visiting our iniquities upon us).³

The basis of this papal charge is contained in the

¹ *Vom Kriege widder die Tuercken. Mar. Luther. M. D. XXVIII. Wittenberg.* Pp. 32, quarto.

² *Eine Heer-predigt widder den Tuercken. Wittenberg MD XXIX.* Pp. 30, quarto.

³ Erlangen ed. of Luther's Works, *Opp. lat. var. arg.* IV, p. 277.

commentary on his Ninety-five Theses, which Luther had published in 1518.⁴ In explaining his fifth thesis he had said: "The Pope does not intend, nor is he able, to remit any punishments except such as he has imposed either by his own authority or by that of the canonical law." As an instance of a punishment which the Pope could not remove, Luther has pointed to the chastisements and scourges imposed by God. If a priest, Luther said, could remove these, let him try to put an end to wars and revolutions, and repel the invasions of Turks and Tartars; for he must be a sorry Christian who does not know that these are scourges wielded by God's hand. True, Luther continued, most people in these days, and among them the greatest men in the church, are dreaming of nothing else than war against the Turks, because they mean to fight, not against their own iniquities and gross sins, but against the scourge with which those sins are being punished by God, who has said that He will visit our iniquities if we do not put them away ourselves.⁵

Others had expressed similar sentiments prior to Luther, without incurring the papal displeasure. Towards the end of August, 1518, John Miller of Augsburg had published a Latin treatise by Parthenius,⁶ in which the following excoriation of the prevailing type of Christianity occurs:

There are those whom Christ the Saviour calls His own and who are called gods of the nations. In course of time they became successors to the apostles, with the understanding that they were to walk before all men in sanctity of life. By following their footsteps and obeying their precepts the rest of man-

⁴ *Resolutiones disputationum de indulgentiarum virtute*. Weimar ed., I, p. 233.

⁵ Weimar ed. I, p. 535.

⁶ *Oratio Tranquili Parthenii Andronici Dalmatiae Contra Thurcas ad Germanos Habita*. Pp. 10, quarto.

kind were to obtain the true and immortal glory that has long been prepared for us and was promised by the prophets. But these very men are now bent on avarice, gluttony, envy, and gain their ends of ensnaring men by employing most deceptive and detestable tricks.

These words were directed against the clergy of the age. Referring to Christians in general, the author says:

Let us now come down to the certain evidences of our ruin: Our crimes have brought on this war that is made upon us [by the Turks]; I say: our crimes; for, tell me, pray, is there any heinous crime that we have omitted? any vice in which we have not indulged? any infamous practice into which we did not hurl ourselves headlong?

In the same year the firm of Sigismund Grimm, the physician, and Marcus Wirsung, at Augsburg, had published a treatise of Ulrich von Hutten,⁷ which discusses the papal politics in the war against the Turks for the benefit of the German Diet then convened at Augsburg. It was the last diet held during the reign of Emperor Maximilian and was attended by Cardinal Cajetan, before whom Luther had been summoned to appear to recant his Ninety-five Theses. Hutten's treatise was published with the consent of the Emperor. The author argues that the hue and cry about war with the Turks had often been a false alarm started by the popes. Under pretense of fighting off the danger of a Turkish invasion the popes had again and again extorted money from the Germans.⁸ Was waging wars at all the busi-

⁷ *Ulrichi de Hutten Equitis Germani ad Principes Germaniae, ut bellum Turcis invehant. Exhortatoria. Publico Germaniae, Concilio apud Augustam Vindelicorum. Anno Domini. M. D. XVIII. Maximiliano Austrio Imperatore. Cum Privilegio Imperiali.* Pp. 20, quarto.

⁸ "It has been proven that the Pope diverted to the benefit of one of his nephews a large sum from the money which he had exacted from the believers, namely from the tithes that had been assessed upon them [by the Lateran Council, 1512-1517], for war against the Turks." Koestlin, *Martin Luther*, I, p. 149.

ness of the popes? Until Pope Julius II had taught him to know better he had always believed that the business of the head of the Christian church was to preach peace, not to wage war. That pope had asserted the church could not be satisfied with the keys of Peter; it must also wield the sword of Paul. Leo X had proclaimed himself a prince of peace; it was, therefore, strange that under his administration the cardinals were issuing to the whole world plans for a war which they had elaborated. This made it appear as if the Germans did not know how to wage war, and must be advised by reverend fathers, in whom it would be more becoming if they were to pray for the Germans. Why did not the Roman Curia send the German Emperor part of the money which it was squandering on the boundless luxury of the papal court? Why was it unwilling to remit at least a part of the huge charge for an archbishop's pallium? Not that the author was pleading for subsidies from Rome for the Turkish War; he would be satisfied if Rome were not permitted to levy assessments for this war, and if steps were taken to curb the Pope's power, lest he hinder this laudable enterprise, as he had done in the past. For, in the last analysis, it was plain that the popes were better pleased with an increase of the power of the Turks than of the Germans. Popes had by their machinations tried to restrain the German Emperors Henry IV and V from their invasions of the Orient. Hutten wrote:

To give you my opinion freely, this is my reason why I believe that when this war is begun you should consider your interest in Asia not less than your interest in Rome. I am so far from wishing that you should do anything upon the counsel of the most reverend fathers, that I hold you must look for everything from yourselves. You must frame your own counsels and not admit those foreign counsellors who are full of treachery.

In May, 1522, the popular *Türkenbüchlein*⁹ was published. In the form of a dialogue it discusses the question, whether Turkish rule would be better for Western Europe than Christian rule. The sins of the present Christian rulers, both secular and ecclesiastical, are openly admitted:

It will also be necessary to issue a public prohibition enjoining upon everybody that he refrain with all possible diligence from blasphemous cursing and other evil customs, such as simony, drunkenness, usury, sumptuous feasting, adultery, highway robbery, etc. For as a punishment for our sins God permits the aforementioned oppression [Turkish invasions] to come upon us.

In 1523 Hartmut von Cronberg, a German knight who had espoused the cause of the Reformation, published an Open Letter to Adrian VI, the successor of Pope Leo X, in which the following measures were advocated: The Pope is to abdicate his pontificate and divide the Papal States, the *patrimonium Petri*, between Emperor Charles V and King Francis I of France, and by this sacrifice reconcile the two greatest antagonists within the Christian church of that time, in whose intrigues the papacy is always involved; bishops, monks, and priests are to surrender their possessions and all the wealth which they have obtained unlawfully, and confess their errors; church property is to be used for the support of the clergy; any surplus from the revenues of bishoprics, pious bequests, and monasteries is to be used for ransoming Christian brethren now languishing in Turkish captivity.¹⁰

The reluctance of German diets under Charles V to vote subsidies for a war upon the Turks reflects the age-

⁹ *Tuerckenbiechlin Ain Nutzlich Gesprech oder Underrede etlicher personen, Zu besserung Christlicher ordenung un lebens, gedichtet.* Pp. 22, quarto. Author and place of publication not given.

¹⁰ Weimar ed., XXXII, p. 91.

long distrust of the political maneuvers of the papacy. This distrust was older than the Reformation, which only served to intensify it by laying bare the spiritual tyranny and unbounded secular imperialism of the popes. But it was a political convenience for the papal party to blame Luther for the lukewarmness of many Germans toward an armed undertaking against the prodigious growth of the Ottoman power; it threw additional odium on Luther and his work and made the Pope appear as the loyal champion of Christianity over against Mohammedanism, and as the stalwart guardian of the political liberty of Germany and the supremacy of Charles V (against whom he was forming secret alliances). In those turbulent times of stress and storm it was a common occurrence for either side in the religious controversies that were arraying men against each other to blame the other side for any national calamity, disaster or misfortune. That is a well known psychological phenomenon. But the papacy was particularly dexterous in fastening upon Luther such troubles as the devastating Peasants' Rebellion, priest-baiting, the religious indifference and moral laxity of the people, and especially the Turkish invasion.

On October 24, 1518, Pope Leo X through his chamberlain, Charles von Miltitz, transmitted to Elector Frederic of Saxony the Golden Rose with a letter in which he says:

Noble Sir and beloved Son. It seems to us more necessary every day to take thought for a crusade against the Turk's unholy wrath. . . . But while we were considering how to bring this to pass, and were bending all our forces to this end, Satan reveals this son of perdition or of damnation, Martin Luther, of the order of St. Augustine, who has dared in your territories to preach to the Christian flock against us and the holy Roman see.¹¹

¹¹ Smith: Luther's Correspondence, etc., I, p. 126.

This meant that the suppression of the Lutheran heresy was such a serious matter that it must take precedence of measures to meet the Turkish invasion.

In a letter of July 8, 1520, to the same prince, the Pope, speaking of the asylum which the Saxon ruler is affording Luther, says:

We cannot say whether we think you have acted more wisely or more piously in this affair. For it is singular wisdom to recognize that a furious man, by no means obedient to his vow of humility, moved by ambition to resuscitate the old heresies of the Wyclifites, Hussites and Bohemians, already condemned by the universal Church, one who manifestly seeks the money of the people, one who by his interpretation of Scripture gives occasion of sinning to the simple, one who breaks the bonds of chastity and innocence, and by his profane words also confession and contrition of heart, *one who favors the Turks* [Italics mine], and deplors the punishment of heretics, one, in short, who tries to mix the highest things with the lowest; it is singular wisdom, I say, to recognize that such a one has not been sent by Christ, but by Satan.¹²

From the Diet at Nuremberg Francis Chieregato, Bishop of Tetramo, wrote to the Marquis of Mantua, on January 10, 1523:

We are occupied with the negotiations for the general war against the Turk, and for that particular war against that nefarious Martin Luther, who is a greater evil to Christendom than the Turk.¹³

These papal charges were not only echoed from many a pulpit and formed the subject of monkish harangues, but they were also repeated in popular literature. After the fall of Rhodes a rhymed treatise was published anonymously,¹⁴ in which the fact is deplored

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 334 f.

¹³ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 159.

¹⁴ *Anzeigung ze eroberen die Tuercky, un erloesung der Christenheit. Auch wie die Insel Mahumeta durch die ordensluet des koenigreichs Wolfarie erobert ist. Dabei alle staend Tuetscher nation soellen ein underwysung naemen.* Pp. 16, quarto.

that so many monks are quitting their monasteries and adopting the evangelical faith which divides the Christian church. This faith is nothing but lip service,¹⁵ because it denounces the practice of good works, and is bringing untold misery upon Germany. In fact, Germany is facing its utter ruin now that the Turks are preparing to overrun it. Unless the rulers of Germany promptly suppress the new teaching and restore the old order of the papistic church, the end is at hand, as Scripture has prophesied.¹⁶ Not only by hints and innuendoes, but also by direct mention of his name, Luther in this tract is charged with being the cause of the Turkish invasion.

After the disastrous defeat of the Hungarians by the Turks at the battle of Mohacz a pamphlet by an unknown author was published by Wolfgang Stöckel in Dresden in 1526. It contained the fictitious correspondence of Nickel Eigenwillig (Nicolaus Stubborn) of Breslau and Rev. Paul Anderbach in Redletz.¹⁷ The former views the crushing defeat at Mohacz as a divine

¹⁵ Die Christenheit ist gar zertraent,
Evangelisch sich ein jeder nent,
Und nimpts mit waercken wenig an,
De gloub des mauls jetzund als Kan.

¹⁶ Darumb ir fuersten solten weren
Und nit ein jeden lassen leren,
Dan der in der geschryfft waer gegruendt.
Die Christus Jesus hat verkuendt.
Und das sy all larten glych,
So wurd der gloub bald meren sych,
Und wurd all Irrsal bald vergan,
Der gloub Christi yn friden stan.
Wo ir aber das nit Fuerkummen,
Ist zbsorgen das von euech waerd gnummen
Der zaeppter yn teueschland
Und gaeben un ein ander hand,
In alten testament wir dess vyl hand.

¹⁷ Ein Sendbreiff darynn angetzeigt wird vermeinte ursach warumb der Tuereck widder die Hungern triumphirt un ob-gelegen hab. Antwort und verlegung obgemelter ursach, durch das rechtgeschaffen wort Gotes und was oder wo dasselbig seye einem jtzlichen Christen zuuoren zu disen getzeiten lustig und nutzlich zu lessen.

retribution for the treatment which the pure Word of God, restored by Luther, has been given by the Germans. It has been treated with open contempt and its teachings are maliciously resisted and hindered by men who would prefer to have the Word of God put back into the state of innocuous desuetude in which it was kept under the papacy. The latter admits that the Mohacz disaster is a divine punishment; however, it has been visited on Christians because so many had forsaken the tried and true faith of the fathers and the goodly order and salutary discipline of the Roman Church and the Holy Father. Misled by the delusive flummery of that unprincipled fellow Luther, an apostate from religion, men had cast away the faith which their ancestors had victoriously maintained at the point of the sword.

One publication in those days must have given Luther especial pain. The aged John Spiesshamer (Cuspinianus) of Vienna, to whom Luther had sent an account of his stand at the Diet of Worms, in 1521, immediately after his return to his lodging from the council hall, published a pamphlet after the battle of Mohacz.¹⁸ In this publication he turns against Luther in the following terms:

Be not influenced, O rulers, by the futile assertion of one who claims that fighting against the Turk is fighting against God who is visiting our sins upon us. If the author of this claim were with me now he would speedily have to confess himself insane with his worthless and foolish opinion. To spare you, Luther, I have hitherto been unwilling to refer to you

¹⁸ *Oratio Protreptica Joannis Cuspiniani ad Sacri Ro. Imp. Principes & Proceres, ut bellum suscipiant contra Turcum cum descriptione conflictus, nuper in Hungaria facti, quo periit Rex Hungariae Ludovicus. Et quia Turcus Solomet ad Budan usq; pervenerit ex Alba graeca, cum enumeratione clara dotium, quibus a natura dotata est Hungaria, cu insertione multarum reru annotata dignissimarum. Lege lector & judica in quam miseria hodie Christianitas est conjecta.* Pp. 16, quarto. The publisher was John Singren, of Vienna.

by name. But in two tracts, one of which you poured forth recently to my fellow-countryman Assa,¹⁹ you have said again and again that a war against the Turks, which you alone have foreseen with prophetic vision, is foolish. Therefore, I could wish you had seen the tyrant Solomet in the royal city of Buda, abusing your own wife, slaughtering your son or daughter and casting them to the dogs, in order that all could have witnessed your sanctimonious conduct and your fortitude of mind—you, who alone among men are void of human feeling, being placed outside of the pale of humanity's law, a stone rather than a human being. But we shall condone your offense since you are far from our regions, sitting among the beer-guzzlers at Wittenberg. If I had here seen you, the renowned prophet and vain pretender, laughing at these cruel spectacles, I should say that you had preached the truth [namely, when preaching submission to the chastising rod of God].

The sarcastic reference in the letter of Cuspinianus to Luther's prophetic foresight is explained by Luther's statements in his two writings, published in 1520 and 1521, in defense of his teachings which had been condemned by the papal bull of excommunication.²⁰ In the first, which was in Latin, Luther had called attention to two facts which rendered a military expedition against Turkey inadvisable: The futility of all previous undertakings of this sort, and the waste of enormous sums of money which, under pretense of the Turkish War, had been carried off to Rome. As a retribution for the sins of the people, he held, God had raised up against them at Rome a wilder, more furious, and more ravaging horde of Turks than the real Turks could ever

¹⁹ In 1526 Luther had dedicated his treatise, *Whether a Soldier Can Be in a Godly State*, to Assa von Kram, a distinguished captain who had served as commander of the troops of the Elector of Saxony in the Peasants' War.

²⁰ *Assertio omnium articulorum M. Luthéri, per bullam Leonis X. novissimam damnatorum*, which Luther began to write Dec. 1, 1520. It was published towards the end of that month by Melchior Lotther, of Wittenberg. (Weimar ed., VII, p. 92). This learned treatise was popularized in a German edition, entitled *Grund und Ursach aller Artikel, so durch die Roemische Bulle unrechtlich verdammt sind*, published by Melchior Lotther, of Wittenberg. (Weimar ed., VII, p. 302.)

be. Accordingly, the defense against a Turkish invasion must begin with penitent prayer on the part of all the people and with the liberation of the Emperor and princes of Germany from the fraud at Rome. He would risk speaking as a prophet: Unless a quietus were put upon the Roman pontiff, Christianity would become a lost cause. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear, and keep away from a Turkish war while the authority of the Pope prevails on earth. I have spoken."

In the second treatise, which was in German, Luther explained that his remarks, which the Holy Inquisitor at Rome had reprobated, did not mean that no war must ever be made upon the Turks, but that those who engage in such a war must first be sure that God is gracious to them and their enterprise. They must not go bungling into this war, relying on papal indulgences, and then discover on the battlefield that God did not favor their cause, and they would meet with reverses such as are recorded in Joshua 7 and Judges 20:12 ff. Before all else God would look for godly living among His warriors; but that was something that was shunned by the Pope, who nevertheless wanted to eat up the Turk. That was the reason why expeditions against the Turks hitherto had resulted so miserably that, where formerly the Turk had conquered one mile of Christian territory, he was now holding sway over a hundred, and yet the people were so blind that they did not see that they were following after a leader of the blind from Rome.

When Leo X wrote his fatherly letter to his noble son, the Saxon Elector, on October 24, 1518, he also wrote to the Elector's secretary, George Spalatin, Luther's intimate friend.²¹ This prompted Spalatin to

²¹ Smith: *Op. cit.* I, p. 127.

ask Luther for his opinion on war against the Turks. Luther answered, December 21, 1518:

If I rightly understand you, you ask whether an expedition against the Turks can be defended and commanded by me on Biblical grounds. Even supposing the war should be undertaken for pious reasons rather than for gain, I confess that I cannot promise what you ask, but rather the opposite. Recently at the request of a friend I published a sermon on this subject, which has fallen into the hands of the heroes of Brandenburg, on whose account I suspected the request was made to me. In this I argued that no such war should be undertaken. I am still of the same opinion until I shall be refuted with better reasons. Erasmus expresses the same opinion in many places,²² as you know better than I. It seems to me if we must have any Turkish war, we ought to begin with ourselves. In vain we wage carnal wars without, while at home we are conquered by spiritual battles.

Moreover, neither in the Old nor in the New Testament was any war ever waged by human might, save with an unhappy and disgraceful issue; if it was successful it was because of aid from Heaven as I could amply substantiate. Now that the Roman Curia is more tyrannical than any Turk, fighting with such portentous deeds against Christ and against His church, and now that the clergy is sunk in the depths of avarice, ambition, and luxury, and now that the face of the church is everywhere most wretched, there is no hope of a successful war or of victory. As far as I can see, God fights against us; first, we must conquer Him with tears, pure prayers, holy life and pure faith. But of this elsewhere.²³

Luther points to the lessons of past history as advising against a rash attack upon the Turks. The Christian student of history cannot but view with dismay the type of Christianity with which the forces of Mohammedanism came into contact from the beginning. It is easy to sneer, as Gibbon does, at the decadent Christian church in the Orient, swept by heresies, torn by schisms, sinking into the fatal sleep of a dead formalism. Those

²² In his Epistle on Peace, to Antony of Bergen, March 14, 1514, which Spalatin translated into German.

²³ Smith: *Op. cit.* I, p. 140 f.

Christians had little, either in their creed and shibboleth or in their lives, that could command the respect of the shrewdly observing Moslems. Nor was the situation improved for Christianity when, in the age of the Crusades, the forces of the Western Church, at the command of the popes, were hurled upon the East in a vain attempt to capture from the infidels the sacred places of the Holy Land. The greed for worldly glory, the incessant striving for preferment, the double-dealing and treachery, the greed and lust that were rampant among the crusading knights and their vulgar retainers could not impress a high spirited warrior like Saladin with the superiority of the Christian religion and the saintliness of its foremost representatives. Untold wealth was wasted, rivers of blood were recklessly poured out on the plains of Asia Minor, in a futile effort to vindicate the cause of God, who was supposed to have willed these energies that should have been devoted to worthier causes in the home countries of these warriors. The few short-lived successes achieved by them could not disguise the fact that their enterprises had usually ended in failure, and even these successes had soon been wiped out.

After the battle of Baphoeum the Ottoman hegemony over the Moslem forces began to be built up. Soon the Eastern Empire felt the shock of the oncoming destroyer, which was to work its complete ruin within two centuries. The Sultan's bodyguard, the Janissaries, was built up out of an annual levy of a thousand of the finest Christian boys. The Ottoman ruler Orkhan (died 1359) entered into the most intimate relation with the Byzantine court, of whose Emperor a modern historian says: Cantacuzenus had, "with that curious contempt for the decencies of family

relations which characterized the Christians during the whole period of Ottoman triumph, given his daughter Theodora in marriage to the sexagenarian Moslem Orkhan, despite the difference of creed and age." Against his own son-in-law, John Palaeologus, he called in the aid of Orkhan who defeated the pretender to the Eastern throne and saved Constantinople for Cantacuzenus. Together with the Empress-regent Anna he stopped at nothing to conciliate the Ottoman Sultan and win his aid in his domestic struggles. Their usual fee was to allow the Turk to ravage one of their provinces and carry off into slavery as many Christians as he pleased. A contemporary chronicler relates that these slaves were transported to Scutari, an Asiatic suburb of Constantinople, and still belonging to the Greek Emperor. With the consent of Cantacuzenus, Scutari became "the principal depot of the trade in Greek slaves," and Orkhan the Turk came to visit his Christian father-in-law at this convenient mart. The open enmity between the Christian merchants of Genoa, who had a trading post at Galata, another suburb of Constantinople, with the Christian merchants of Venice was skilfully used in his interest by Orkhan.²⁴

During the reign of Murad I Adrianople was captured, in 1361, soon thereafter Philippopolis and the whole of Macedonia and Thrace. In 1364, by the terrible defeat at Maritza, the Christian forces under Louis I of Hungary and Poland and the princes of Bosnia, Serbia, and Wallachia were swept off the field. The Greek Emperor at Constantinople, who had not scrupled about becoming a convert of the Latin Church, now thought it safe to become of vassal of Murad. Ragusa on the Adriatic by treaty, in 1365, placed itself

²⁴ Stanley Lane-Poole: Turkey (G. P. Putnam's, 1903), p. 33.

under Ottoman protection. Once more the Eastern Christians under Lazarus of Serbia threw themselves upon the Turks, but were utterly routed in the battle of Kosovo, in 1389, and the dramatic assassination of Murad by the Serb Milos Kobilovich could not stay the continuous aggression northward and westward of the Ottoman forces. Under Bajazet, who threatened to stable his horses at the high altar of St. Peter's in Rome, the doom of that part of Europe was sealed; for the Christian forces that had gathered in a crusade against the Turks which the Pope had preached were routed in the bloody battle of Nicopolis.

The popes had hitherto looked on with complacency while their Eastern brethren were slaughtered by the Turks; for were not these people who did not believe in the procession of the Holy Spirit also from the Son damnable heretics that deserved the Moslem scourge? But when the Turkish hordes began to look across the Danube, Western Christianity began to reflect that the divine retribution for reprobate Christianity might not stop at the confines of the Eastern Church.

Under Murad II (1421-1451) and Mohammed II (1451-1481) the Greek Emperor Manuel, by his duplicity in supporting the pretender to the Turkish throne, Mustafa, had provoked the anger of the Turks, and it was only the heroism of Hunyady that prevented Murad II from putting an end to the shadowy sovereignty of the Greek Emperor at Constantinople, which had become a very small island in a Moslem sea. It fell under its last emperor, John Justiniani, on May 29, 1453, before the irresistible onrush of the Ottomans under Mohammed II. The Christian forces under Hunyady and the priest John Capistrano gained a Pyrrhus victory over the Turks at the siege of Belgrade

in 1456. But its effect was spoiled by the Pope and Cardinal Julian who used their spiritual influence to induce Hunyady to break his oath to the Turks and break up the treaty of Szegedin, by employing the celebrated and infamous argument which Cardinal Ximenes had urged with equal success upon the conscience of Isabella of Castille, viz., that oaths are not to be kept with infidels.²⁵ Moreover, all the effects were wiped out a few years later when the Turkish forces, in 1477, started a campaign against Venice, crossed the Tagliamento, and reached the banks of the Piave.

Into the lifetime of Luther falls the reign of three Turkish Sultans: Bajazet II, 1481-1512; Selim I, 1512-1520; Soliman the Magnificent, 1520-1566. During the reign of the first of these Christian honor was deeply stained by the vile negotiations into which their greatest men entered with Bajazet concerning the safe-keeping of the pretender to the Turkish throne, Prince Jem (also called Jemshid, or Zizim). Fleeing from the wrath of Bajazet this young prince had fallen into the hands of the Grand Master of the Knights of Rhodes, D' Aubusson. For 45,000 ducats a year, to be paid by Bajazet, he agreed to keep Jem from re-entering Turkey, while at the same time he nursed the prince's hope of gaining the Turkish throne with the aid of the Western Christian powers. From one stronghold of the knights he was transferred to another; without realizing his plight he was a prisoner at Nice, Roussillon, Puy, Sassenaye, where the daughter of the Christian commander, Philipine Helen, was employed to sweeten his captivity, while Jem's grief-stricken wife sent 20,000 ducats for his liberation. "Christian chivalry fattened upon treason." Charles VIII of France decided to

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 90.

possess himself of this valuable object of barter with the Turks. Later he passed into the custody of Pope Innocent VIII who demanded 40,000 ducats for his guardianship, and of Pope Alexander Borgia who charged 300,000 ducats for his delivery to the Turks, but did not consummate the bargain because the Prince died suddenly, it is thought by poison. "Of such chivalrous stuff were made the famous Knights of Rhodes, and of such men as D' Aubusson the Church made Cardinals."²⁶

The Ottoman power rose to its zenith under Soliman, to whom the ancient caliphate was transferred from Egypt and who now became also the supreme ecclesiastical head of the Moslem world. He was twenty-six years old when he ascended the throne, at the death of his father during a campaign. In 1521 he captured Belgrade; in 1522 he wrested the last Christian stronghold in the East, the Isle of Rhodes, from the Knights, who put up a most stubborn defense under their Grand Master Villiers de L'Isle Adam. Encouraged by the Christian king Francis I of France who, in league with the Pope, wished to curb the growing power of Emperor Charles V, he invaded Hungary and at Mohacz, August 29, 1526, defeated the forces of Louis II with immense slaughter, the King himself being slain, and gave Ofen-Buda the capital over to all the horrors of a sack by the infuriated and lustful Turkish soldiery. Returning to his capital for a brief respite he came into Hungary once more, established a tool of his, Zapolya, as King of Hungary, and crossing the Raab at Altenburg was before the walls of Vienna on September 27, 1529. The resistance which he encountered here was so great that on October 14 Soliman raised the siege and went back beyond the Danube.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

Luther's views regarding a war against the Turks were well enough understood by his friends and associates. They knew that it was not cowardice, love of ease, or misapplied pacifism that had prompted Luther's utterances. They saw the historical truth and the spiritual side of Luther's arguments. But they also saw with growing dismay the disingenuous treatment which Luther's attitude received from his enemies, and how seriously the progress of the Reformation was hampered by it. They urged Luther to publish his views on war against the Turks and on war in general in a more exhaustive statement, so that the people would see that he was not by any means "favoring the Turk," either his religion or his rule, and that his patriotism might not be questioned. Luther complied with these requests by writing the treatise, *Whether Soldiers Can be in a Godly State*, to which reference was made before. At the conclusion of this treatise he voiced his horror at the Turkish atrocities. Soon after he wrote an *Exposition of Four Consolatory Psalms*, which he dedicated to Mary, the widowed Queen of Hungary, whose husband had fallen in the battle of Mohacz. At the end of this treatise²⁷ he speaks out in holy indignation at Christian rulers and bishops who deem it a more urgent duty to persecute poor preachers and law-abiding citizens of the evangelical faith than to check the inroads of the Turks.

But the most satisfactory explanation of Luther's attitude on the Turkish invasion is given in the two treatises cited at the beginning of this article. The first of these Luther dedicated to Landgrave Philip von Hesse, with these words:

Grace and peace in Christ Jesus our Lord and Saviour.
Serene, highborn Prince, gracious Lord.

²⁷ St. Louis ed., V, p. 1 ff. Weimar ed., XIX, pp. 552 ff., 604, 23 ff.

Certain persons have been begging me for the past five years to write about war against the Turks, and encourage our people and stir them up to it, and now that the Turk is actually approaching, my friends are compelling me to do this duty, especially since there are some stupid preachers among us Germans, (as I am sorry to hear) who are making the people believe that we ought not and must not fight against the Turks. Some are even so crazy as to say that it is not proper for Christians to bear the temporal sword or to be rulers; also because our German people is such a wild and uncivilized people there are some who want the Turk to come and rule. All the blame for this wicked error among the people is laid on Luther and must be called "the fruit of my Gospel," just as I must bear the blame for the rebellion²⁸ and for everything bad that happens anywhere in the world. My accusers know better, but God and His Word to the contrary, they pretend not to know better, and seek occasion to speak evil of the Holy Ghost and of the truth that is openly confessed, so that they may earn the reward of hell and never receive repentance or the forgiveness of their sins.

Therefore it is necessary for me to write of these things for my own sake and the Gospel's sake and to enter our defense; not because of the blasphemers, however. They are not good enough to make it worth while to say a single word of defense to them, for to them the Gospel must always be a stench and a savor of death unto death, as they have deserved by their wilful blasphemy. But I must write in order that innocent consciences may not any longer be deceived by these slander-mongers, and made suspicious of me or my doctrine, and may not be deceived into believing that we must not fight against the Turks. I have thought best to publish this little book under the name of your Grace, who are a famous and mighty prince, so that it may be the better received and the more diligently read. Thus, if it came to a discussion of a campaign against the Turks, the princes and lords would readily recall it. I commend your Grace to our merciful God's grace and favor, that He may keep your Grace against all error and against the craft of the devil, and illumine and strengthen your Grace for a blessed reign.

Your Grace's devoted

MARTIN LUTHER.²⁹

²⁸ The Peasants' War.

²⁹ Smith: *Op. cit.* II, p. 456 ff.

To summarize this treatise, Luther says that Christians, as such, must indeed not resist evil, as Christ has commanded, and they must not make war upon the Turks as enemies of Christ. Moreover, in such a supposedly holy war there would very likely be in the so-called Christian army very few genuine Christians; the majority of the soldiers would be men who in the sight of God would be more vile than the Turks. However, the Emperor, as such, by reason of the office entrusted to him by God, was in duty bound to protect with his secular power his own subjects against the Turks as against robbers and murderers. This duty had nothing to do with faith. Any subject of the Emperor, liable to be called to arms, would march under the banner of the Emperor, not under the Pope's and the priests' banner of the cross. Fighting thus, he would do what behooved him and would fight in accordance with the will of God. Consideration of God's command, Luther held, was the matter of paramount importance. The nation must not rush blindly into this war.

Two men, Luther argued, must take the lead in this war. The name of the one was Mr. Christian, that of the other, Emperor Charles. First must come Mr. Christian with his army, that is, the pious, holy, well behaved Christian people, who are armed with penitent hearts, prayer, and trust in God and who must with these arms defeat, first, Allah, the god of the Turks, which is the devil, otherwise they will not accomplish much with their physical weapons. To incite Christians to these holy endeavors, especially to prayer against the Turks, Luther pictured to his readers from the Koran the abominable teachings of the Turks and the ruin which they cause in the spiritual and secular affairs of men.

It is not a physical conflict then, that is to engage the Christians, as such, in this expedition against the Turks. The physical conflict is to be waged by "the other gentleman," viz., Emperor Charles, the God-appointed governor, and the people who flock to his colors in obedience to his call. Anyone, says Luther, who obeys the Emperor's summons obeys God at the same time, and when he falls in battle he dies in a godly state. The Emperor is to wage this war for the protection of his subjects against robbers and marauders, not as a crusade against infidels, which the Pope has proclaimed. All the princes and the whole empire are to unite their forces under the Emperor and for the time being put aside their mutual quarrels.

Luther rebukes the princes for their failure to do their duty in the past. They have regarded the Emperor's banner as an ordinary silken rag and have not enforced his rule with their fists. They are to behold written on that banner the divine order, Protect the godly, punish the evil! and forget their lusting and banqueting. Luther will have nothing to do with those princes who desire that Emperor Charles should count for nothing and they be themselves the great heroes and masters. Such princes he would esteem no better than the rebellious peasants, and he thinks that, if sedition among the princes and lords of the empire were duly punished, there would be few that would go unpunished.

Finally, Luther reveals his circumspection by uttering a warning against the customary method of Germans of preparing for and conducting a war. As a rule, they underestimate the size, military valor, and loyalty of the Turkish armies, attacking with an inferior force and holding none of their forces in reserve, etc. When an engagement turns out successful for them they do not

press the defeat of their enemy home, but sit down and carouse until they are again hard pressed.

If the princes will stand shoulder to shoulder in this war and Mr. Christian will pray for them, Luther entertains the best hope that the Turk will meet his equal in Emperor Charles. But if present conditions continue, no one supporting the effort of his comrade, bad faith being practiced by all, and great lords going into this war with a retinue not greater than a corporal's guard, Luther confesses that he will not even be able to offer up a believing prayer for the expedition; for to undertake so great an affair in such a childish manner would mean to tempt God. As yet Luther is not aware of any serious purpose among the princes; they treat Luther and the Gospel as if they were Turks, and in these critical times know of nothing better to do than to issue regulations concerning fasting and other tomfoolery.³⁰

The treatise is entirely free from thoughts of employing the crisis confronting the nation for diplomatic maneuvers to secure concessions for the evangelical party in the empire. Luther's ancient opponent, Cochlaeus, who had entered the service of Luther's bitterest enemy among the German princes, Duke George of Saxony, sought to defeat the powerful impression which Luther's treatise was making upon the nation by publishing a reply to it,³¹ in which he sought to involve Luther in self-contradiction by citing his former views of a war against the Turks.

When Luther's Campaign (or Army Sermon)

³⁰ Koestlin: *Op. cit.* II, p. 116 f.

³¹ *Dialogus De Bello Contra Turcas, in Antilogias Lutheri, per Ioannem Cochlaeum. XV. Contradictiones, ex duobus primis Quaternionibus Libri Lutherici de bello, contra Turcas. M. D. XXIX.* The title page and the last two are adorned with woodcuts. Pp. 88, octavo. The publisher was Valentin Schumann, of Leipzig; the date of publication, July 14. The book was issued *sub pio ac per omnia Catholico [sic!] Principe D. Gerogio Saxoniae Duce*, etc.

against the Turks was published Soliman had already beaten a retreat from German soil. Accordingly, this second treatise of Luther was chiefly a call to the nation not to tolerate any further aggression of the Turks. He instructs the conscience of Christians regarding the true character of the Turks, whom he believes to be the lesser antichrist in the vision of Daniel (7:8), of Ezekiel (39), and of John (Rev. 20:8). The Turk is the cruel tyrant who ravages Christians with the sword and at the same time vomits forth horrible blasphemies of Christ. He is in alliance with that other enemy of the Christian church who cunningly sets up a false cult within the church, according to Daniel 11:36, and exalts himself above all gods, according to 2 Thessalonians 2:4.

The former enemy Christians are to meet in the manner which Luther had described in his previous treatise. While they are to be ready, as Christians, to suffer every tribulation which God visits upon them, they are, as citizens and loyal subjects, to fight with cheerful courage in defense of their native country and their earthly possessions. That is God's will and command to them.

Luther pictures death incurred in such a cause as a service rendered God and as a martyr's death, preferable by far to death on the sick bed after a lingering illness, and after long agonizing conflicts with the devil and one's own accusing conscience, which drive many to commit suicide. Why should it be worse to die on the battlefield, when we may die any moment in our home or during our travels on land or sea?

The Germans must not be terrorized by the cruel practices of the Turks, who hack women and children to pieces or carry the latter on the points of their lances. Such doings are foolish, for they do not harm the poor victims who enter the Heaven of God's saints by their

martyr's death; but they harm these Turkish demons, for their inhuman rage incites their enemies to fury and fills them with the courage of despair. However, Christians must be given to prayer and the fear of God, and study to grow in grace and holiness, while pursuing this bloody business against the Turks. A great part of the treatise is devoted to details, how a campaign against the Turks may be started and executed.

Luther warns the Germans against cowardly preferring captivity in Turkish lands to the hardships of a Turkish war. But if anyone should be so unfortunate as to be taken captive he instructs him how to practice his Christian faith among the Turks and not permit himself to be deceived by Turkish sanctity so as to apostatize from the Christian faith. The examples of the saints in Bible times who had to pine in bondage in foreign lands under pagan governments are cited to illustrate Luther's meaning.³²

This treatise of Luther rapidly went through a number of editions and proved an excellent preparation against the invasion of the Turks in 1541, when Luther also composed the hymn:

Lord, keep us in Thy Word and work,
Restrain the murderous Pope and Turk.

This hymn, together with Luther's admonition to Prayer against the Turks³³ were used frequently at divine service in the evangelical churches.

³² Koestlin: *Op. cit.* II, p. 188 ff.

³³ St. Louis ed., XX, p. 2194 ff.

THE REVIEW

CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

IT IS INFORMING, ILLUMINATING, STIMULATING TO NOTE THE responses of thinking men to life. Single expressions often gives us new glimpses, even new views, of the vast ferment of our existence. As this is of course true in the religious world, we give, from various sources, these brief utterances having to do directly or indirectly with religion. We may not agree with everything they say, but most of them invite serious reflection:

"The social interest and influence of a great Christian man sweeps out in concentric rings from his central position in Christ."—*Zion's Herald*.

"The Tenth Commandment has a peculiar significance in our day. Covetousness among the nations flung the world into the most terrible war of history."—*The Watchman-Examiner*.

"Since God first spoke to man the rules for the true life have not been changed. All that has happened is that we have to play our part in other circumstances."—*The Expository Times*.

"Not even yet has the world been evangelized, and every pastor knows that evangelization is but the beginning of 'Christianization.'"—*Rev. I. D. Eavenson in Home and Foreign Fields*.

"The supposedly peculiar characteristics of races, classes and other social groups are usually but variations of a general pattern produced by special circumstances."—*Reinhold Niebuhr in The Christian Century*.

"The truth is that men avoid the presence of death as much as they can; they pretend it is not imminent; they swagger and shrug their shoulders as if they were going to live forever."—*The Drifter, in The Nation*.

"Within a few years, the wall of ignorance that centuries have built has crumbled. Jesus has become, instead of the forbidden name, a theme of popular discussion among the Jews."—*Paul I. Morentz in The Lutheran.*

"However, if we are to be an elect race of true priests it will be out lot to be thought peculiar in this at least, that we hate evil and all that subverts the good."—*Walter David Knight in The Presbyterian Magazine.*

"We commonly need to be believed in order to believe ourselves, and if it were not a monstrous heresy and even impiety, I should venture to say that God is refreshed by the faith that men have in Him."—*Miguel de Unamuno.*

"We have drifted into a serious inconsistency. Namely this, that while we have claimed a life-embracing religion we have neglected to apply it thoroughly to the whole of life."—*Edwin A. Brown in The Christian Advocate.*

"The business of the churches to-day, as never before, is to give to rushing and accelerated multitudes 'that peace which the world can not give.'"—*President, Church and Sunday School Music Publisher's Association, in New York.*

"To compel people with small differences to submit to technical legal defenses that often are raised for no other purpose than to wear them out, is a practical denial of justice to the poor."—*H. H. Sawyer in The American Mercury.*

"The great majority of human beings are simple-hearted, trustful folk for whom the printed word still has (in spite of newspapers and hyperbolic advertisements) a certain mystical and almost sacred authority."—*Aldous Huxley in Vanity Fair.*

"It is a source of satisfaction to me that I have never neglected the Bible. Through thirty years the Bible has held the central place in all our Tabernacle thinking."—*Dr. Charles E. Jefferson, pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York.*

"Instead of guiding our youth to understanding, we have been trying to stuff understanding down its throat by a process of forcible feeding, while professors stand by as policemen."—*Chancellor John G. Bowman, University of Pittsburgh in The American Magazine.*

"The reason we have so much graft and moral rottenness today is that we have not enough courageous manhood to de-

nounce, scorch, and scourge out of society and out of the Church and out of our political parties the men who are doing these things."—*The United Presbyterian*.

"Trickery and fraud—that is impossible! Deliberate imposture is not the substance out of which the religion of millions of mankind is created. The nineteen hundred years' faith is not founded on deception."—*Dr. Joseph Klausner of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, in The Life of Jesus*.

"It is now known to all leading scientists and criminologists that the 'born criminal' type does not exist and never has existed. The myth merely appeals to the public's imagination and has been popularized by fiction, stage, and screen."—*Warden Lewis E. Lawes of Sing Sing Prison, in The World's Work*.

"How pathetic is intellectual poverty! Not only for the embarrassment it frequently occasions its victim, but also for the sense of utter loneliness that it brings to his soul when mere sensations have lost their original charm and there seems to be nothing new or stimulating anywhere in existence."—*Zion's Herald*.

"After a considerable inquiry among Illinois farmers, the investigator found that farmers who are church members are more friendly to pure milk campaigns, more willing to have their herds tested, quicker to place the general before their private interests, than the average in their communities."—*The Christian Century*.

"If the political world provides that freedom in which religion may best accomplish its task, the religious forces of the country may surely show their appreciative interest by making their contribution to the moral and spiritual elevation of political life."—*Ralph B. Urmey, editor of The Pittsburgh Christian Advocate*.

"Yes, New York is stimulating to the artist. But its stimulation is so incessant that the fine cutting edge it first gives to the faculties soon wears down. To live with it, the true artist must retire into his memory, creep into some secret cranny of the mammoth walls to shut himself up alone with the work he has planned."—*The Saturday Review of Literature*.

"With all its benighted antiquities, its stock of shopworn and second-hand goods, and its large proportion of timorous

members and leaders, the Church nevertheless is the most august and spiritually effective body of persons on this planet. It has been in every century of its history, including the present one, an extraordinarily creative and transforming force.”—*Rufus M. Jones*.

“Most immature adults don’t want to be cured. They prefer to go through life expressing their emotions without restraint. The time and place to begin the cure of emotional infantilism is at home, in the cradle. The girl who said that her mother had been ‘raised a pet’ put her finger on the commonest cause of emotional inability in adults.”—*Frank Parker Stockbridge in the Red Book Magazine*.

“Speed and energy are unmistakable marks of the church-spirit of today. But anyone who will maintain that we are the equals of the mediaeval schoolmen, or the Reformers, or the early Puritans in good, hard intellect is a rash controversialist. We tend mentally to be quick, popular and shallow, forgetting that truth is an austere master.”—*J. R. P. Sclater in The International Journal of Religious Education*.

“Industry hurt religion because it nourished the physical sciences beyond the psychological; because it accustomed men to think in terms of cause and effect; because it made them handle impersonal mechanisms rather than growing life; because it gathered them into cities, where every faith lost edge by rubbing elbows with a hundred hostile creeds; because it increased the prosperity of men and enabled them to enjoy the earth too well to lose themselves in hopes of heaven.”—*Will Durant in The Century*.

WE MUST BE CONTINUALLY ASKING OURSELVES, ‘WHAT IS THE meaning of life?’ We wonder what it means in general, and what it means to us as individuals. It is often too drab, too utterly wearisome, to seem worth while. And indeed, to many who endure rather than enjoy it, it is not worth while, except that it fosters some vague hope of full compensation hereafter. Some miserable ones consent to go on with life simply because death means a sinister hazard from which they shrink. But the Christian holds an attitude the sane and happy reverse of all this. For him the life in Christ means life more abundant here and now—not perfected, to be sure, but definitely begun.

Principal David S. Cairns not long ago wrote a stimulating article in *The British Weekly* upon this theme, the meaning of life. In it occurs this fine passage upon the element of adventure in the Christian life:

"Life as Jesus Christ lived it, and as we seek to live it as His disciples, becomes an adventure, a trust, a destiny, and a sacrament.

"First of all every real Christian life is at heart an *adventure upon God*. 'Religion,' said Donald Hankey, 'is betting your life that there is a God.' The Christian religion is betting your life that the supreme reality and power over all things is the God Whom Jesus revealed; it is risking your life, your honour, your possessions, your happiness continually upon Him. In other words, the soul of the Christian life is always faith, and faith is always venturing upon the unseen. 'Faith is always,' it has been said, 'a going against appearances.' Every student of the Gospels knows that Jesus Christ was always talking about faith, calling for more of it as the sum and substance of true life, practising it after such a fashion that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls him 'the pioneer and perfection of faith' in God.

"We cannot come into filial relations with our Almighty Father without committing ourselves thereby to a life of adventuring. If we are not taking practical risks for Him, exploring more deeply the unrealised and undiscovered mysteries of His love and wisdom, rejecting immediate gains for the sake of higher ends, gambling with worldly profit and honour for the sake of 'the things that cannot be bought with a price, and do not die with death,' then we are not living by faith. Oliver Cromwell, whom a great historian has called the greatest practical genius whom our people has ever produced, once said 'A man never rises so high as when he does not know where he is going.' That seems a very unpractical thing to say. What did he mean? He meant, I think, that when you are following what you believe to be God's will, when you are, that is to say, following justice, love and honour, you have not the smallest idea where they will take you before your day's work is done; and if you have enough faith, you do not greatly care. You do not know about the day's chances. You know that you are going home to the eternal abiding place of your true self, of justice, love and honour."

A FIRE BURNING OVER A WASTE PLACE DOES NOT CONTINUE ITS sweep because everything in its path is inflammable, but because it finds enough combustible things to pass on the consuming power that changes them to flame and light. The progress of Christianity is like that. There is no promise that all will be converted, but those who take fire from the divine flame pass it on to others of like capacity. This thing is not a matter of education, important as education is, but it is a thing of spiritual responsiveness to spiritual power. Indeed, education, in the formal sense, sometimes unfortunately tends to quench spirituality.

Writing in *The Christian Century* under the singular heading, *The Religion of a Fool*, Gregory Vlastos has given us a personal experience that illustrates these facts. At college he encountered a culture which did not comprehend Christ, but, in a self-confident fashion, sadly misinterpreted Him. Despite such an atmosphere, in his senior year this student seeking the light made the discovery that the one supreme thing worth living and dying for was religion. This led to his decision for the ministry, but for a time his soul revolted at the idea of the seminary—the seminary of the conventional intellectual rather than vital type.

“Every time I heard of anyone going to a theological seminary,” he writes, “I felt sincerely sorry for him. A group of would-be ministers, all herded together, and made to study dogmatic theology, apologetics, and church history—it seemed pitiful. Every one of those words was charged with an emotional content of the most unpleasant kind. Going to seminary seemed like serving a three-year apprenticeship at a funeral director’s establishment; three years of living with the dead. But I went there all the same.”

Evidently he was willing to pay any price to get into the ministry, and so his gloomy forebodings as to a seminary course could not stop him. But, if his funereal apprehensions were not exactly realized, he at least encountered very real difficulties. Here is what he discovered:

"First of all, I could see where some of my former sympathy for theologues had been wasted. These people were not half-wits as I imagined. And as for dogmatic theology and church history, they were not so bad as I thought. But the real shock came later. It was when I realized with a shudder that I had come looking for religion and had fallen into a den of common sense. Students and teachers seemed one and all disciples of common sense."

"And the classes? One of the first courses I had was on 'the teachings of Jesus.' I had fondly imagined Jesus a fool, a fool who was wise enough to believe in his own madness. I had thought his teachings dangerous, charged with high explosives. I had thought of him wondering throughout Palestine not having where to lay his head, and I had seen him very clearly on the cross—the picture of what the business man had called 'failure.' I had heard him asking people to do absurdly impossible things, like, 'Turn the other cheek,' 'Take up thy cross,' and 'Sell all that thou hast.' But now it appeared that I was mistaken. Jesus was a sensible man, it seemed, no fanatic, no idealist, but a practical man who knew his psychology, and knew his politics, and talked accordingly. What I had taken for dynamite in his teachings was only the exuberance of an oriental imagination, that exaggerated purposely to wake up a sleepy audience. They could not be taken literally—they were never meant to be so taken. Follow them? Yes, but only after diluting them, interpreting them, and translating them from an agricultural Palestine to an industrial America.

"I listened, dumfounded at first. But the arguments were incontrovertible. And after I had resisted culture and laughed in the face of practicality, I had come to a seminary to be finally overcome by the words of a theological professor, and was silently accepting a Jesus of common sense. I yielded though not without a sense of the irony of the situation."

The class room deliverances and the whole atmosphere were on this order, and his effort to retain his own views and faith collapsed. As he says: "I might have resisted these things severally, but the cumulative effect was too strong. Before long I had rid myself of my quixotic ideas, and was laughing at my former sentimentality when I had taken Christianity at its face value."

So much for what college and seminary did to faith, but

this pilgrim's progress passed into another stage. Vlastos tells us that last June he left the seminary for a summer pastorate in a small Montana church, and that here his struggles began again. Faith was reasserting itself, as he was compelled in all honesty to face the fact that people "had come there to church for spiritual food." In seeking to give it to them he has begun to find himself, as these closing reflections show:

"And now I am again turning over in my mind this question of religion versus common sense. Not that I am undecided on it, but that I want to make the issue clearer. People choose first on instinctive and sentimental grounds, and then find bad reasons for their choice. These bad reasons they call philosophy. That is what I am trying to do now. And, first of all, I am convinced that the import of this question is not intellectual but moral. The unreasonableness of Christianity is not the unreasonableness of a fairy-tale passing for history. There is a fairy-tale in Christianity, but Christianity is not the fairy-tale. You are not asked to believe it, unless you want to. People have become excited when Santayana tried to tell them that Christianity, while a fairy-tale, is not a lie, for the simple reason that no fairy-tale ever meant to tell the truth. But this is only confusing the issue.

"The answer is simple. Common sense and religion, as rival strategies of life, stand to each other in the same relation as the old to the new, looking backward to straining forward, following the beaten path to blazing a fresh trail. Common sense is the distilled wisdom of the past. It is rule o' thumb. It rests on solid fact. It has been tried and found to work. It is safe and sure, but monotonous and dull. Religion—my religion, I mean, not the religion of common sense—is the vague premonition of something bigger that lies ahead. It also rests on facts, but facts of a different kind called possibilities, facts that may be and will be, rather than facts which have been. The one thing it lacks is safety. It carries no insurance.

"Religion was the faith of great dreamers. It was the revolt from common sense. But it lost out when it became organized, not because it was rejected, but because it became popular. And then followed that monster, the religion of common sense, when common sense invaded the stronghold of the adventurers. It made religion safe; there was everything to gain, and nothing to lose, the favor of the gods in this life, and a cheap heaven in the next. But its victory was never complete. The world

will never lose the memory of its greatest fool, who promised nothing but the cross, yet dared ask men to follow him. What if common sense seems to hold the field? What if culture and practicality today have taken possession of seminary and church? So long as Jesus' words echo through the ages daring men to take up their cross and follow him, religion will never die. There will always be some who will listen to that voice, and arise to follow it, a smile on their care-free faces, a song in their happy hearts. This be my company, this be my religion—the religion of a fool.”

ONE OF THE OBSESSIONS OF OUR INTELLECTUAL AGE IS THE FEAR of positive convictions. We seem to be afraid that, if we commit ourselves whole-heartedly to any belief, we must somehow surrender our freedom of reflection and decision. Out of this general attitude has come the present unfriendliness to dogma. To be known as dogmatic is to be labeled as narrow. Yet the thinking that gets one anywhere must be founded on the assurance that certain things are forever true. Suppose that somehow the fundamental principles of mathematics came to be shadowed with uncertainty; who could trust the engineer's calculations for a great bridge, and who would trust himself on it with any comfort even if it were built?

Religious dogma is, of course, the chief object of attack. One may play with doubt, he may advance a hypothesis, he may discredit an article of faith, and still be a leader of modern thought. but he must not stand firmly for a Christian dogma. He may, however, dogmatize on science without loss of reputation, even though the point he makes is under dispute.

Writing in *The British Weekly* upon Dogmas and the Plain Man, A. E. Whitham has put these things both clearly and forcibly. Speaking of the logical position of the church in this matter he says:

“Much of this talk against dogma is cheap, thoughtless and not seldom insincere. What it amounts to is, ‘Let us have your Christ, but don't say anything definite about Him.’ ‘Bid the world follow Him, but don't bother about His credentials.’ ‘Let the Church do good, but don't trouble us with the reason for her activity.’ People want the Church to stand for some-

thing, but not to stand on anything—which, of course, means that all her castles will be castles in the air. They want the Church to speak out against a hundred and one brazen assertions, but not to speak assertively.

“Now, when men or communities do not know where they are they not seldom become the pawn of men who do. The Church that does not know where she stands becomes the puppet of men, states, nations or policies that do. I think the late war offers examples of this.

“Dogma means that the Church knows where she stands, that she has something definite to say, and has reasons for her audacious assertions.

“Further, it may be noted that all practical men are dogmatic, and often such men are the men you trust even when you do not fully agree with them. If a man in the great matters of life is not dogmatic likely enough he will, in the ways of the world, become expedient, and in other things superstitious.

“All the men who get things done are dogmatic: militarists, bolshevists, scientists, accountants, all men who are dealing with realities, whether of science, finance, book-keeping or the ultimate things of life.

“Yes, says one, that is quite right when you are dealing with hard reality. A man may talk dogmatically on some economic or scientific point, but not about God and religion. There, of course, every man must hold his own opinion, think what he likes; but never be so foolish, or so ignorant of the nature of the subject as to be sure.

“But I would answer very deliberately that the only subject upon which a man may be expected to be utterly dogmatic is upon the subject of religion and God. For the simple reason that he does believe he is there dealing with ultimate reality, that is with the unchanging things. The only matter upon which I can say the same thing yesterday, to-day and for ever is that which by its very nature is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever.”

But then there are highly objectionable dogmatists, and Mr. Whitham does not overlook them. After referring briefly to those, like the inquisitors and the communists, who would compel men to accept their ideas, he continues:

“There is also the man who will not allow his right to become more richly right by taking up into his experience some-

thing of yours, the man who, not having windows in certain directions of his own, refuses to look through yours that he may behold the increasing glory of life. There are men who have got hold of a right who never increase and enlarge it, seeing it in growing fullness through the manifold experience of men. There are members of the old evangelical school about whom this must be said. They are right in the main, but they are not right with that opulence of meaning that truth carries to the hospitable mind. There are men also who are dogmatic about secondary matters that have little or no relation to primary things about which only we may be dogmatic. I do not think great spiritual truth is ever debateable, and if we keep our sincerities we recognise that. But many men are very sure of debateable things—crude views of the infallibility of the Bible or the Pope, about pipe-smoking, card-playing, breaking bread, or breaking the Sabbath. They will thunder about these matters that have to do perhaps at their best with high expediency as though these things stood shoulder to shoulder with the final things of the spirit of man and God.”

The closing words of this writer deserve to be pondered by every preacher. They are as the utterance of a prophet concerning the great dogmas entrusted to the church and their capacity to respond to the needs of men:

“The dogmas of the Church will always be richer and fuller than the principles of any one man. I do not want a Church that believes less than I, but more. Young men with blood of youth pulsing through their veins like fire say, ‘I don’t want to sing your hymns about heaven.’ No, of course not, but a day will come when that young man, no longer young, will want hymns about heaven, when that section in the hymn book will grow very precious. A man says, ‘I do not care for your cross and atonement.’ No, perhaps not, but a time will come when the man has sinned a sin he cannot forgive himself. Then the Cross will stand out against the sky of his life as the arms of God, and ‘Christ died for sinners’ will sound ineffable music.

“The Church must have many things behind the counter that the people are not just now asking for. One day somebody will ask for a certain thing, and ask anxiously, knowing that if the Church does not keep it there is no place where it may be found. So in the light of true catholic experience, the larger experience of the ages and humanity, I am concerned to keep many dogmas that do not at the moment appeal to me.

One day I may ask for these neglected things, as men who are hungry ask for bread."

IF IT BE TRUE THAT "NO TWO WORDS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE mean exactly the same thing," then the speaker and writer should remember that he has in this fact the possibility of those fine, yet real and expressive, distinctions which add clearness and power to one's utterance. They are also a delight to intelligent souls.

But commonly we are careless and use interchangeably terms which carry different ideas. Two such terms are Deity and divinity. Someone wrote Professor David Smith, who conducts a column in *The British Weekly*, for his opinion as to the difference between these two words, and from his answer in that journal we give this statement:

"Each of these terms occurs but once in the New Testament, and their use is peculiarly instructive. (1) In his epistle to the Romans (i. 20 R.V.) St. Paul writes: 'The invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even His everlasting power and divinity'—not 'Godhead,' as our Authorised Version unfortunately has it. The Apostle is here demonstrating the inexcusability of the heathen for their moral depravity, inasmuch as they were not ignorant of God and His requirements. They had indeed no Law like the Jews, but they had the revelation in Nature, 'that universal and public manuscript,' as Sir Thomas Browne styles it, 'that lies expans'd unto the eyes of all.' And this suffices to make ungodliness inexcusable. Yet it is incomplete. For what is it that is there revealed? Not God Himself but merely His attributes—His power, His righteousness, and in a measure His beneficence; in brief, Divinity but not Deity. In Creation and Providence we see God's working but not God Himself.

(2) Where is it that we see Deity? This St. Paul tells us in his epistle to the Colossians (ii. 9), where it is written of Christ that 'in Him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily' or rather 'all the fullness of Deity embodied.' In Him there was not merely Divinity—Godlike endowments, but Deity—the divine nature. In Creation and Providence we see God's attributes; in Christ we see God Himself, presented to human sense under human conditions."

THE WORD LITERATURE IS ONE OF THOSE UNFORTUNATE TERMS that have lost sharp definition. It is applied to everything from the language of the Scriptures to that of circulars advertising some household commodity. The cultured person, however, associates it with those enduring expressions of human experience and emotion exhibited usually in fine poems, essays, dramas, and fiction. There is often excellent literary style in other writings, but we do not always regard these as literature in the high and exact sense.

Real literature, then, has its springs in the deeper and more abiding feelings of mankind. And among these the religious feelings hold a large place, for, the broader and higher and nobler our thoughts, the more inevitably do they rise toward the spiritual plane. This observation is not confined to religious minds; it is recognized among literary critics. For example, Michael Williams, one of the most prominent Roman Catholic writers, has, in *The Forum*, quoted Henri Bremond of the French Academy as quoting in turn from John Middleton Murry this asseveration: "If, then, as I believe, religion is the fundamental reality of the human soul; if the consciousness of the soul itself demands for its very existence the consciousness of God; the lesser 'I am' can only be in virtue of the greater 'I AM' from which it draws its life—then literature, which is a manifestation of that same soul whose deepest anatomy is contained in religion, must inevitably be knit up with, be indissolubly bound to, religion. There is no escape. Religion and literature are branches of the same everlasting root."

This conception is emphasized in a recent essay published in *The Atlantic Monthly* under the title, *Why Literature Declines*. Its author is Robert Lynd, British essayist and literary reviewer. He expresses doubt as to the development of any great painting, sculpture, music, and literature in the future. He takes up literature especially, and his view is so worthy of attention that we give several excerpts:

"My own belief—and there is some evidence for it—is that literature begins to go to the dogs as soon as Earth becomes

restive and declares its independence of Heaven. In the great ages of literature, Earth was, if not a suburb of Heaven, a subject kingdom. Heaven and Earth were places on the same cosmic map; civilized men believed in the existence of Heaven centuries before they believed in the existence of America, and believed in it just as firmly as we do in the existence of America to-day. Possibly their ideas of Heaven were even more mistaken than the modern European's ideas of America. But at least the life of mortals was lit up for them by the presence of the immortals, and the gods presided over human destinies. To me it seems impossible to believe that it is a mere accident that all the supremely great epics, from Homer's to Milton's, were written by poets who not only accepted the heavenly background, but wove it into the theme of their narratives. The gods may not be the most interesting of the characters in the *Iliad*, but the mortal characters seem to borrow a radiance from them, and to take part in larger wars than those of which historians write in prose. Take the gods out of the *Iliad*, and you diminish the heroes. The battlefield of Greek and Trojan would, in the absence of the gods, seem as petty as a lamp-lit town over which hung no firmament of stars. We may not be able to explain why this is so, but we know that it is so. We know that in the presence of the stars we feel an exaltation and liberation of the spirit such as we do not feel in the light of the lamps in a street. It is as though the stars enlarged our world and gave us the freedom of the universe. If we could imagine the extinction of the stars, we should think of the world as an infinitely impoverished place. Literature, I believe, would suffer an equal impoverishment as a result of the death of the gods."

"Without this inspiration men lose the high gift of song. I do not mean by this that a man who is intellectually an atheist or an agnostic cannot write great literature. What I do contend is that the literary imagination is akin to the religious imagination, and that literature, while it has its roots in earth, flourishes in its greatest splendor when its branches are stirred by some air from Heaven."

"Everywhere the imaginative man confronted with the mystery of life and death is forced to adopt a religious attitude to life—the attitude of awe before the eternal mysteries. Without it there can be neither the greatest poetry nor the greatest prose—neither the verse of Milton nor the prose of the Bible and Sir Thomas Browne. Great poetry will cease to

be written when poets cease to be men for whom the invisible world exists. And if this is true of poetry, is it not reasonable to believe that it is also true of imaginative prose, which is only poetry in its week-day dress?"

THE MAN IN THE PULPIT SOMETIMES HAS TO DECIDE WHETHER he wants to be a pleasing religious orator or an effective preacher of the Gospel. The temptation is to permit the manner to overshadow the message. Has one any message, to begin with? If so, with what does it chiefly deal, and what are its facts and points? A real message is concrete; it may touch abstractions, but it is not an abstraction. The Gospel, designed for lost men, has its own philosophy, but it is not a system of philosophy, nor is it made effective by being received as such. It is a matter of fact, and of facts. Hence, other things equal, the most attractive as well as persuasive preaching is that which adds to our religious information. These paragraphs from *The Presbyterian Advance* about ministerial "slipping" have great homiletic value for young preachers—and old ones too:

"Some preachers are slipping—know themselves to be slipping and are known by their congregations to be slipping—simply because they do not put into their sermons real information, freshly acquired. Every good public address tells its hearers something which they did not know before. Phrase-making is a minor part of speech-making. All the New Testament sermons were compacted of facts. The preaching of the early church was largely the telling a story, previously unknown to the listeners. Facts are portable; rhetoric is not. That is why hearers of the apostolic message could in turn become tellers thereof.

"Present-day sermons are conspicuously lacking in this element of information. 'I cannot recall a single new thing that I have learned from my pastor's sermons in a year,' was the criticism made by one Presbyterian layman. With profound and portentous changes going on in the world-wide work of the kingdom; so that, as the old hymn says,

'Each breeze that sweeps the ocean
Brings tidings from afar';

and with the conditions and methods of religious activity at

home undergoing transformation, there is more than an abundance of fresh and fertilizing facts awaiting proper presentation from the pulpit.

"Still more important stands the need to state the facts and teachings of the Bible, in a time of swift and strange changes in public thinking. How many ministers are there who present an ordered and systematic story of the Bible in the course of a year,—or of ten years?

"Facts take finding: they are not to be got out of books of sermon outlines and illustrations. The hard work of wide reading and real study is requisite to the preparation of fact-filled sermons. But it is work that pays large rewards in interested and intelligent and loyal congregations. Also it is a definite means of growth and of grace for the preacher himself. The livest ministers are the tellers of actual 'good news.'"

ONE IS TEMPTED FREQUENTLY TO WISH THAT THERE WERE NOT so many interesting books published—it is distressing to realize how few we can read. But we are somewhat consoled by the fact that everybody else is in the same case. And this fact, that one has time to read carefully only a very small part of what is written, sends us to the reviews. Indeed, book reviews form an important literature in themselves, and a reviewer who passes on an author's main thesis in a commendable way may give it even greater currency than the book itself will ever enjoy. In *The Churchman*, H. Adye Prichard has given us this striking paragraph, in his review of *The Agony of Christianity*, by Miguel de Unamuno:

"The point of view stressed in these pages seems to be that of pure mysticism—the contention that Christianity as such has nothing to do with the external conditions that help to mould the life of men—with Democracy, civil liberty, dictatorship, tyranny, war, peace or progress. Its agony is due to the fact that it is set in a world in which the values of those things and the activities of those things hold a pre-eminence altogether out of proportion to their real importance. If the Church wants to keep itself Christian, the author says, it must preach neither for nor against any of those things. The agony is illustrated by reference to the spiritual lives of such men as Pascal and Père Hyacinthe."

THE GOSPEL MESSAGE DOES NOT CONSIST OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS, but nevertheless that message is not complete with the ethics omitted. There is, however, a tendency in pulpits of very opposite types to stress either the theological or ethical element at the expense of the other. Faith in the Redeemer must be preached, but obedience to the Master must not be neglected. If we do not remember both we are in danger of either fruitless faith or faithless works. As A. J. Muste of Brookwood Labor College has said:

"There is no use pretending to be a Christian minister if one is not prepared to preach the ethics of the message of Jesus, as well as the other sides. The thing is a seamless garment which cannot be parted. The business of preaching principles and implications without indicating what they mean in specific conditions is pretty dangerous, and a pretty soft thing to do; and, therefore, it is the preacher's business today who takes Jesus seriously to know the industrial situation thoroughly. It is at least as important as church history and Hebrew. Having that background of being in earnest about the principles and implications of the gospel, and the background of concrete knowledge about the industrial situation, a preacher ought to go ahead and follow the light perfectly fearlessly. He doesn't need to look for trouble—it will probably find him."

THERE IS A GREAT PLACE FOR THE GENIUS WHO CAN FIND A WAY to prevent people from see-sawing between extremes. If you want a little mental exercise while waiting for dinner, make a list of subjects of general thought that have seen a complete shift from one side to the other, and perhaps back again—whether the hen or the egg was first, whether heredity or environment has the greater influence, whether parliaments or benevolent despots are better, and so on.

In the present debate over the merits of the individual versus those of the group there seems to be a disposition to recognize the value of both sides; that is, to reach the safe middle ground. This extract from *The Christian Advocate* at least contributes to this hope:

"The individual has disappeared from modern society.

This being the case, it is not surprising that he should have dropped out of the Church.

"There was a time when he alone was in evidence. Sermons were preached to him, like Reginald Campbell's famous series. Revivals were conducted for him. Activities were planned to arouse and deepen his interest. But all that was long ago.

"Then came the discovery of the group. It was a belated discovery, long overdue. But it came with something of a shock of surprise, especially to the Church, and in many quarters it aroused resentment.

"With the discovery of the group, and of the larger aggregation of humans known as society, the individual gradually passed from sight and mind. He was completely forgotten by some who should have been keenly alive to his existence and importance, teachers, writers, preachers.

"Now the time has come to rediscover him.

"This does not mean that we are to go back to the unprofitable ways of a discarded individualism, that we are to neglect the group and lose the vision of the social whole. In some sections an outworn type of individualism is in full swing today. If a choice must be made between *that* and a social vision which does not see the individual because of the group, probably the latter would be more serviceable. But no such choice must be made.

"In fact we cannot rediscover the individual except as we see him in his proper setting in society. He is always to be found living his life in a network of human relationships. But let us not forget that *he* is there, and that *he* needs and deserves consideration."

HOW MANY OF OUR CHURCH MEMBERS REALIZE THE CLOSE resemblance between the relation of the apostolic church to its surrounding pagan world and the relation of our present missionary force to the heathen world it encounters? The average Christian at home is too far away in time from the first century to comprehend the tremendous revolution the Gospel wrought in countless lives. The evangelistic appeals in our home churches and by our home pastors and workers are in most cases addressed to those who have long had at least some knowledge of the Christian message, or have become indifferent to what they once professed.

But to the heathen mind it all comes as an overwhelming revelation. In an address at the Congo Jubilee Exhibition in London, Rt. Hon. J. Ramsay MacDonald delivered this strong vindication of missionary activity:

"As soon as the missionary appears slavery is doomed. I do not say that it is doomed in twenty-four hours, but I do say the presence of the missionary has this effect, explain it as you may—that from the moment he becomes a part of the atmosphere of a race, slavery dwindles and education begins.

"Men whose lives have been long lived in the atmosphere of ignorant superstition and mortal terror are enabled to lift up their heads and to discover that there is something giving them power, enabling them to walk about with heads uplifted, obedient to the law, but not victims of the law, enabling them not only to look out on the world but within themselves.

"There begins responsible care, which at last emerges into a conception of the responsibilities of usefulness lending them the idea of responsibility to the universe.

"I think the missionary requires no further justification.

"We who have been called upon to attend to the secular affairs of life rather than the spiritual will never fail to be grateful, I hope, to the missionaries who have carried into effect the gospel of human justice as well as of spiritual power."

THE LAYMEN APPEAR TO BE ASSUMING MORE OF THE RESPONSIBILITIES of the church than they once did. In many cases it has been little more than a preacher's church which laymen supported and attended. Now the layman is assuming burdens that the pastor to a great extent used to shoulder alone. This does not apply simply to the temporal affairs of the church. In the growing tendency of laymen to engage in spiritual leadership in various ways there is hope for a better day for the distinctly religious power of the church. Still, many faithful pastors realize that the lay members have not measured up to their opportunities. The Christian Advocate has published letters from a number of successful ministers concerning what they wish their laymen would do. From one of them we quote these two sane and earnest wishes:

"I wish that my laymen would be more expectant of them-

selves, their preacher, their church, and their God, and much less satisfied with partial achievement. I wish that they would hold me to the highest standards of preaching, leadership, and character, encouraging me when I come nearest (though even then so far) to these ideals, and never approving claptrap and cheapness.

"I wish that my laymen would realize that their greatest contribution to the church, one that is basic to all else, is their own Christian character and consecration. Unless they are, first and foremost, sincere followers of Christ, all is fruitless."

EVEN YET, WITH ALL THAT IS SAID ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF the Christian nurture of youth, Protestantism has much to do before the religious training of its children can meet its opportunities and responsibilities. The Sunday School is, in many instances, little more than a feeble attempt to meet a great need. Yet, with its possibilities even approaching realization, the Sunday School should be the most effective arm of the church. A secular journal, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in referring to the recent World's Sunday School Convention, spoke of the vast influence of Christianity, and then added:

"The real source of all this spread of the Christ spirit is the Sunday school. That is where Christian education has its chief seat. That is where the missionaries get their inspiration and the devotion which leads them to consecrate their lives to the carrying of the gospel message to distant and alien lands, often at the imminent risk of their lives from violence and always at their risk from disease and lack of comforts and sanitary conditions of living. Not alone the spread of the Christian religion and of its ethics upon the minds and impulses of men of all races and nations depends upon the religious education of the young, but the very continuance of it even in our own land. For the welfare of mankind the religious education of youth is the most important work in which one can engage. Without it would arise a social condition we dare not even contemplate. That is why it is the world's greatest and most needed force."

WE HAVE BEEN OVERWORKING THE CONVENTION AND CONFERENCE idea as a means of getting ultimate results in Christian work. Somewhere, however we go about things, there must be

individual interest, responsibility, and activity, or little of permanent value will be done. A local church that discovers talent for Bible teaching and then systematically develops from it a strong teaching force does more for itself and its community than can all the conventions it can ever get its young people to attend, good as these gatherings may be in many ways. The International Journal of Religious Education editorially gives this illustration:

"A pastor recently was heard to say, 'I've been taking my officers and teachers to conventions for the last ten years where they have heard the same speeches over and over. Now they got help out of the meetings, but two observations worried me; firstly, I discovered that I was developing professional "conference attenders" and, secondly, my leaders got the idea that two days in a convention gives sufficient training for a year. These conventions made them parasites, as it were, prone to depend upon others for inspiration and help. They asked for help of all kinds, "canned" programs, and so forth, by which they might do their work with little effort.'

"Well, this pastor, Rev. M. M. Snyder, of Youngwood, Pennsylvania, decided that conventions and lesson helps were not enough. So he began an intensive program of leadership training, both of present leaders and of future leaders with the result that fifty-two people of a school of approximately five hundred are taking training in the Standard Leadership Training Curriculum. He has a class during the church-school hour and two other classes through the week. Last year, thirty-eight people completed one unit or more in the Standard Curriculum. 'Now,' says this pastor, 'conventions mean more to my people because they can be creative when in cooperative sharing with leaders from other churches.'"

THE FACT THAT A COLLEGE IS CONTROLLED BY AN EVANGELICAL denomination no longer guarantees a desirable religious, or even moral, influence upon its students. Formerly the fact that a school was under a particular church made it reasonably certain that parents could trust their children there with little fear that their faith would be disturbed by anything from a faculty source. But the situation has greatly changed today, and the question arises, whether one reason may not be that

the principal financial support often comes from a few successful persons who are not particularly concerned about religious matters.

Dr. James A. Beebe has given, in *The Western Christian Advocate*, a list of hindrances to the church college, and here are three of them:

"1. A new type of student, attracted to the school by its buildings, its fraternities, the success of its athletics, the fame of its faculty, instead of its Christian atmosphere.

"2. A new type of teacher, the product of the modern graduate school, 'whose ideals are materialism in physical science, mechanism in biology, behaviorism in psychology, determination in history, imperialism in government and industry, expediency in ethics', all of which tend to neutralize the Christian ideal of life and God and man. This teacher unlike the pastor-teacher of earlier years, feels no obligation 'to make his students good.' He yearns for 'research' and 'productive scholarship', by which last he does not mean 'constructive results in the lives of students.'

"3. A new type of administrator, who is more of a business man than an educator (as he is often called), who has few contacts with the student body, who is concerned chiefly with the problems of organization and finance, and who, at the hazard even of losing his soul, must make a showing of growth and expansion to hold his own with the overshadowing State school and highly endowed non-sectarian private school."

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE WRITER DIFFERS FROM THAT OF THE speaker. The latter's utterances, as he proceeds, are more or less directly influenced by the response he perceives in those before him; the writer's audience—to make the term more inclusive—as yet has no real existence and cannot modify his statements, save as his imagination seeks to anticipate their reception. The writer may therefore easily be the bolder of the two, from an almost physical sense of security and a lack of anything like stage fright or diffidence.

This position of the writer with respect to his public has its advantages and its dangers. It enables the man of wide knowledge and sound judgment, but who lacks the speaker's

gifts and temperament, to place his ideas before his fellows, often with convincing power; but it may quite easily tempt him to a certain rashness that is not courage, and to ill-timed assertions that break the force of a presentation otherwise strong. All this has led Aldous Huxley to comment upon Print and the Man in a way to encourage humility on the writer's part; for, as his article is condensed by The Reader's Digest from Vanity Fair, he pricks literary pride in such remarks as these:

"For the shy and retiring the profession of writing has special charms. It enables them to say their say without their coming into any personal contact with the men and women to whom the say is addressed. It permits them to exert an influence on the affairs of the world, an influence which can sometimes be enormous and epoch-making, without ever mingling in its tumult. Sitting remote and misanthropic in his hermitage, Jean-Jacques Rousseau impressed himself on Europe almost as profoundly as Napoleon at the head of his armies. Across the modern world the shadow of the much-whiskered, library-haunting student, Karl Marx, lies dark and gigantic."

"But, much as I enjoy these privileges of authorship, I can see that they have their dangers. The impersonal author, unknown and invisible to his readers, is spared many of those personal difficulties and criticisms which keep the ordinary man of action healthily in his place. The man who makes personal contacts with his fellows runs the risk of being laughed at, if he is ridiculous; of being knocked down, if he is offensive; of simply being ignored, if he happens to lack the impressive personality which commands attention and inspires respect. The writer runs no such risks. Behind the impressive facade of print he lives secure and remote.

"Now, print enjoys a strange and almost invincible prestige. A man must be an extremely hardened and cynical reader before he can quite ignore that prestige. The great majority of human beings are simple-hearted, trustful folk for whom the printed word still has (in spite of newspapers and hyperbolic advertisements) a certain mystical and almost sacred authority. They start with a predisposition to be impressed with the printed word, to believe in it, to obey its suggestions. If they met the author and he tried to 'put it over them' by word of mouth, their natural instinct would be to resist, to reject his claims to exercise authority.

"The author exploits his reader's respect for the printed word. Concealing his merely human physique and personality, he presents himself to the world disguised in the magic and pontifical robes of pure verbiage."

THERE IS A CORRECT LITERARY STYLE; THEN THERE IS A VITAL literary style. The second ought to include the first, but without the second the first rings with a hollow sound. A piece of writing whose chief virtue is that it violates no rule of grammar, no principle of rhetoric, and is happy in its choice of synonyms, is like an address by a speaker who has a fine presence, an excellent voice, and appropriate gestures, but who has nothing much to say. To speak and write in a way that wins the response of hearers and readers one must not only have something to say, but he must be a sufficient master of his language to make his words convey those fine shades of meaning and suggestion whose appeal to mind and heart are all the more powerful because less obvious.

There is today an immense, but hardly a great, religious literature. It would be a boon to religious life if our spiritual and theological writers paid more attention to the cultivation of a fine and commanding style. It is not enough to convey an idea clearly to the mind; it must come in such a way that the mind welcomes and entertains it, and is moved to action by it. The difference between correct English and that which goes beyond mere correctness is brought out in this quotation from an editorial on Pure English, in *The Saturday Review of Literature*:

"A writer who keeps his thoughts commonplace and says only what others have said before him, can master correct English with very little difficulty. Avoid figures, use no phrase that is heard in talk unless it has been seen in print, write always in general terms, keep the vocabulary small, and the grammar simple. Listen to the radio and read a good textbook.

"But it is excessively difficult to write pure English. 'Pure,' in this sense, as elsewhere, has a moral rather than a chemical significance, and implies responsibility for the full

meaning of every English word. And what histories can be written of those meanings! The writer of pure English chooses his words with a consciousness of life in every syllable. It is not enough for him that a verb takes the accusative, or that 'admire' in a modern dictionary has one very simple meaning. He feels the Latin in his tongue, tastes the rough and concrete Norman or Anglo-Saxon of the monosyllables, knows that 'thrill' is a boring upon a bone, remembers the courtliness of courtesy, and in his choice of rhythms lets the sense be reflected in the sound. How else, with such a heritage, can his English be exigent of its own great powers?"

ONE OF THE CHIEF MARKS OF THIS DAY IS COSMOPOLITANISM. Communication, travel, commerce, education, journalism are all steadily enlarging the vision of men and giving them a more just perspective. In some quarters the spirit of nationalism is still intense, due often to fear of aggressive neighbors, and this begets war and that sort of patriotism always associated with war. Beyond doubt there are many persons who never think of patriotism save as a noble sentiment respecting one's sacrificial love for his country when war threatens it.

In his sermon preached last September at Geneva on the occasion of the ninth assembly of the League of Nations, Dean Inge, after speaking of that loyalty to country so commonly linked with war, proceeded to this conception of a higher and finer kind of patriotism:

"But this sentiment of patriotism is far too noble a thing to be condemned outright. It needs only to be directed into right channels, to be purified from its base, vulgar and archaic perversions. The question is not whether we ought to love our country, but what kind of success and glory and happiness we should desire for it. Instead of the childish wish to paint the map of the world red, or whatever our national color may be, our pride should be to make it honored, respected and even beloved by other nations. A nation is honored in the world for its contributions to literature, art, science and political wisdom. It is honored also for any acts of international generosity, of which there are unfortunately not many examples, but which have not been unknown in modern history. Instances of such generosity are the help which France and England gave to

Greece and Italy in their struggle for freedom and national unity, and the grant of independence to Cuba by the United States. Nations are not incapable of gratitude; the very rarity of disinterested action by a government increases the effect of an act of generosity."

SOME THINGS CANNOT BE SUPPRESSED. ONE OF THEM IS THE inherent right of private individuals to discuss every phase of public affairs. The recent presidential campaign brought the religious problem in this country to the fore, where it will doubtless remain until it is settled in accordance with the principles of righteousness and freedom. Politicians and many private persons may deplore as they will the fact that ecclesiastical differences have precipitated a political issue in America; the intense interest of the citizens in the matter will have to be reckoned with, and high sounding protests and disclaimers will not change the situation. Party platforms may refuse formal acknowledgment of the emergence of Catholicism as a major question, but public opinion shows a strong disposition to accept it as such.

Moreover, this was clearly inevitable, for we reflect that for generations we have admitted to American citizenship vast multitudes drawn from peoples that have been taught for centuries to believe that their church has the right to interfere in the temporal affairs of nations. The late campaign was not the cause of a religious issue in the United States; it was simply the occasion that brought that issue into the open.

If all this meant simply a new outbreak of an ancient debate between religious bodies, it might be interesting, but not important. But it cannot be confined to such limits; for it concerns all citizens as such, since it deals with their secular interests as well as matters of religious freedom. A book recently listed as among the best sellers is *Catholicism and the American Mind*, by Winfred Ernest Garrison, and during the campaign *The Forum* gave first place to a review of it written by John Jay Chapman, who said in part:

"Mr. Garrison gives a truly imposing enumeration of the

various forms of Roman Catholic propaganda now at work in the United States. But he does not make a survey of the social results of this propaganda. There is one outcome of the Roman Church in America which is becoming obvious to everyone: namely, the segregation of our Roman Catholic population into a conscious, moral unity—a unity which throws upon each individual the duty to become a propagandist of his faith. Every Roman Catholic in America must help to forward his co-religionists in every way, both spiritually and practically. The Roman Church acts as a secret society of self-help. The obligation of every good Catholic among us is not only to help the faithful but to punish the outsider and the backslider. This explains much that has long been familiar to us in our political life. Let any man—whether Protestant or Catholic—be known as hostile to Rome, and his income is threatened. If such a man keeps a newspaper stand or is a fireman in a town where Catholics are in control, he is moved off his corner or discharged from his job without mercy. This system we are familiar with in politics; but it is an unwelcome discovery to find that the system has been expanded from politics into every form of business. The propaganda has tended to weld the Catholics into an underground business association.

“It is through this sort of business pressure that free speech about the Roman question has been all but suppressed in the United States. No man dares to refer to the subject. A kind of unwholesome reign of terror is in the air when Rome is mentioned. To bring back free speech about the Roman Church has become the first duty of every American citizen. The way to help bring back free speech is to practise it; and this book of Mr. Garrison’s is a notable sign of the times and gives hope that our newspapers will, under the pressure of a public demand, throw open their columns to the most enduring of all the issues raised by the present presidential campaign—the Roman Church. No doubt it will raise the cries of ‘religious intolerance.’ But since the Catholic Church is more than a religious organization, it cannot plead benefit of clergy and demand that its activities be protected from public criticism by a sacred taboo.”

A SINGULAR PARADOX HAS BEEN REPORTED FROM ARGENTINA. The Roman Catholics there have undertaken a kind of systematic opposition to Protestantism which Protestants may

heartily approve. It is nothing less than putting the printed Gospels into the hands of the people. Whatever the differences between the version so employed and our own, of which we have not yet seen any account, the message of the Saviour and the cross are there, otherwise something not to be recognized as the Gospels is being circulated. The Christian Advocate gives this statement and quotations:

"In Argentina, where Protestant Bibles have often been seized and burned, a Roman Catholic society has been formed with the avowed object of opposing evangelical propaganda by circulating copies of the Gospels. June 24 was 'Gospel Day' in Buenos Aires. Copies were sold on the street by Catholic young ladies. At a public gathering in a theatre, the speaker said:

"This meeting has a clearly defined end in view, which is to arouse a general movement for the study and the propagation of the great code of Christian civilization, in order to counteract with the divine power that emanates from the inspired book the menacing problem of a cunning demagogy and heresy which would expose to danger the beautiful traditions of the Latin peoples and the settled order of the Argentine people, which never has wished, and never will desire to serve doctrines which in other countries have sown hatred and ruin."

"A Baptist pastor who read a report of this meeting inquired as to the price of these Gospels. He was told:

"We are pleased to tell you that being desirous of giving the gospel the widest possible diffusion to counteract the great Protestant propaganda, we have published the four in one volume, pocket size, cloth binding, which also contains the preparation for Confession and Communion and the Ordinary for Holy Mass. The price is 0.50 pesos.'"

AMERICA MAY BE A MELTING POT, BUT THE TEMPERATURE HAS not yet risen to a point where it can fuse all the materials that have been dumped into it. On the side of religion the Protestant church is only beginning to grasp the needs and possibilities of our large immigrant population. The Italians alone offer a promising field, and one of the largest. They are already an important element in American life. It is said that, next to the National City Bank, in New York, the largest

private financial concern in the country is the Bank of Italy, in San Francisco, whose directors are all Italians.

What of the Italian's religious nature and outlook? The answer to this is especially important to Protestants, and we give it in the language of John I. Daniel, editor of the *Columbus Magazine*, from whose article in a recent issue of *The Presbyterian Magazine* these statements are taken:

"Within a generation 25 per cent of the Italians in this country will be Protestant,' recently declared Peter C. Cavichia, president of the Board of Education of Newark, New Jersey. This may seem at first blush to be a rather stupendous statement, but in view of Thomas Huxley's pronouncement in his day of the Italian brain being the sharpest instrument in Europe, fulfillment of the prediction is far from impossible. Second to no nationality in the world in capacity for metaphysical speculation, and settled in a country that offers so much opportunity for freedom of thought, it is little wonder that Italians in our midst soon after their arrival should commence to chafe under the yoke to their intellects imposed by the Church of Rome.

"Prior to my entrance to a theological seminary I was for two years American editor for a group of Italian publications in and about New York, in which period I wrote up interviews with prominent Italian-Americans in the Metropolitan district on an average of two a week. Considerable conversation, to a large extent apart from the actual subject of the interview usually developed, and it has been my experience that the favorite theme of at least three out of every five educated Italians is religion."

"Religion, in the opinion of most of us, is a personal matter. There isn't a sect in the family of Christ that doesn't, in the main, make better people of its adherents than these would be were they not in any fold. Since this is true it is indeed a dangerous thing to tamper with people's beliefs, to shake them up, to inculcate doubts. If they are satisfied with their religion there is no special merit in attempting to dissuade them, *but* if they are manifestly dissatisfied with their branch of Christianity, if they regard the systems and dogmas that guided their parents as inadequate, semi-pagan and childish, if they are groping for something higher—does it not seem right that they should be helped?"

IF THE CHURCHES OF AMERICA WANT TO ESPOUSE THE CAUSE OF an oppressed people, they might take up that of the American Indian, as he is dealt with by our Indian Bureau, according to the occasional accounts that find their way into print. This is not to imply that our churches are doing nothing for these oldest families among us, but what seems to be the true state of affairs is apparently not widely known. In the dealings of our government with the Indian we have an example of the ease with which the complete control of one people by another becomes something worse than a benevolent despotism.

In Plain Talk, Hon. James A. Frear has told us how the Indians are dealt with, and these statements were reprinted in The Reader's Digest:

"Comparatively few persons realize that today, under the maladministration of the Indian Bureau, the majority of Indians are being appallingly treated. In no other civilized country is an intelligent, well-behaved people kept in such complete subjugation of person and property as are some 225,000 Indians under our disgraceful departmental depotism which deliberately degrades them to a virtual state of peonage.

"Tens of thousands of these Indians are well educated and highly intelligent. During the World War, thousands of Indians volunteered and fought side by side with their white brothers. Because of this, Congress gave to all Indians full citizenship.

"Under the *law*, then, Indians are entitled to every right guaranteed by the Constitution but, under the arbitrary decrees of the Indian Bureau, no less than 225,000 Indians are declared 'incompetent' and are denied both possession of their property and enjoyment of fundamentals civil liberties.

"Indeed, the Indian Bureau holds itself above the law and, in the disposition of property belonging to 'incompetent' Indians, considers that its acts are not reviewable by the courts. More than \$90,000,000 in cash and securities and more than \$1,600,000,000 in land and personal property belonging to Indians, are under the exclusive control of the Indian Bureau, while the owners are denied any voice in its disposal. In consequence, the property of Indians has literally been looted to the extent of millions of dollars."

"The Indian Bureau, years ago, adopted a policy of estab-

lishing 'show place' schools in far Western cities where, it was announced, by separating Indian children from their parents and freeing them from tribal customs, a 'white man's civilization' would speedily be taught. Among the tribes of the Southwest, the cruel policy prevails of taking Indian children from their parents and sending them to schools hundreds of miles distant. Children as young as six years are taken away from their parents—often forcibly—and in many instances, are kept away from home for four years at a time. Thousands of children have been virtually kidnapped under this system, and parents have even been jailed for protesting against the outrage.

"To make it worse, these schools are often terribly overcrowded; the food is often both bad and insufficient; and sanitary conditions frequently are such that an abnormally high death rate brands them as being little better than juvenile pest houses."

THE PRACTICAL WISDOM OF THE SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS MAN HAS become a kind of article of faith with the mass of Americans. But neither wisdom nor folly is the exclusive possession of any class; the imprudent and visionary man is found in all walks of life. We make the mistake of attributing to the individual the strongest or weakest characteristics of his particular vocational group. Let us take, from a condensation, by *The Reader's Digest*, of an article contributed to *Harper's Magazine* by Jesse Rainsford Sprague, this illustration of the folly that big business can be capable of when led by those whose ambitions are greater than their ability to comprehend a whole situation:

"It is remarkable how the fetish of greater volume of business has spread in America during the past few years. In Europe an enterprise that holds its own from year to year is considered healthy. With us there is the well-established theory that a business should show an annual increase.

"I offer this shocking explanation: American business men are more influenced by vanity. An economist recently stated that vanity has dictated the erection of a large proportion of city skyscrapers. Frequently skyscrapers do not pay savings-bank interest, yet 'men who have made fortunes fast

put up the tallest skyscrapers as monuments to themselves and their fortunes.'

"A prominent New York banker recently showed me the financial statements of three manufacturing corporations. None of the corporations had earned an appreciable profit during the preceding year. The largest, doing a business of three millions of dollars, earned precisely \$961. The banker explained: Up to two years ago the corporations, all manufacturing similar lines, paid reasonable dividends. At that time a vain man became the president of one of the corporations and he proceeded to demonstrate his salesmanship powers. He arbitrarily decreed that the volume of business should increase one-third. To that end branch offices were established in various cities where stocks of goods were maintained for quick delivery. The sales force was doubled, and each was required to sell a certain volume under penalty of losing his position. Longer credit terms were extended to merchants. In communities where merchants bought too sparingly, competitors were set up in business and financed by the corporation.

"Sales during one year actually increased from two million dollars to three millions, and to that extent the ambitious president's vanity was satisfied. But the cost of gaining the extra million was so great that practically all profits were eliminated.

"Yet that was not all. The corporation's two competitors were also obliged to speed up their selling efforts in similar ways, in order to protect themselves. Their profits were likewise dissipated. Three important corporations failed to pay dividends because one man wished to appear before the world as a two-fisted, up-and-coming apostle of efficiency."

PRISON CRUELITIES, AS PRACTICED IN POLICE STATIONS, JAILS, AND penitentiaries, according to numerous reports, are a reproach to any nation claiming to be civilized. It is encouraging that this matter is gaining attention, and that efforts to abolish the evil are beginning to be made. The Howard League for Penal Reform has lately investigated prison conditions in different parts of Europe, and its revelations should "horrify civilized people." Would results of a similar survey in America differ to any great extent? The Howard League has drawn up these

recommendations, which, generally adopted, should terminate an ancient evil, without hindering the course of justice:

"Every prisoner should be entitled to be defended by a lawyer if he so desire. If necessary, this should be at the public expense in all cases where the penalty is capital punishment or prolonged imprisonment. The accused should have the right to private interviews with his lawyer before trial and call witnesses for defense.

"Prisoners should have good light, warmth, ventilation, and the best sanitary conditions. Prisoners should be given food sufficient for health and ample water for drinking and washing. They should have sufficient open-air exercise daily. Every prisoner should have facilities for the exercise of his religion and visits from an authorized chaplain.

"Prisoners should be classified as far as possible. Children and young persons should be kept altogether apart from the other criminals. Women prisoners should be attended by women wardens, not by men.

"Every prisoner should be allowed a visit from a relation or friend at least twice a year. Representatives of authorized societies, working solely for the welfare of prisoners, should be allowed to visit every prisoner.

"All forms of torture should be forbidden. No corporal punishment of a severity liable to result in permanent injury should be allowed. No children or young persons should suffer the extreme penalty."

IT IS A FINE TRIBUTE TO ONE'S ABILITY TO BE IMPARTIAL AND just when he can voluntarily set aside his own habits and prejudices to uphold something that runs contrary to them, because he believes it is to the best interests of his fellows. Yet this is what Judge Arthur P. Stone of the District Court in Cambridge, Massachusetts, did some months ago when he gave this testimony as to the value of the Eighteenth Amendment. Because of the large place this subject has in the minds of Christian citizens this year, it is well worth recalling:

"Perhaps, however, the experience of a police-court judge in a district which presents the ordinary problems of a comparatively densely populated community may be of some interest. I ought to say, what I have said many times before, that I did not believe in the Prohibition Amendment, and did

not believe that it could be worked out practically if adopted. Neither was I an abstainer from the use of alcoholic liquors. I have always viewed the problem, however, as a social and economic one, and my experience as judge of the Cambridge District Court has convinced me that the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment furnishes the basis of the solution as to the control of the liquor traffic.

"I am sorry for anyone who feels that a horrible injustice has been done, but I am not much worried about the theoretical injustice to a few when I find a practical benefit to the many. I know that nearly 200,000 people of the district where I preside are far better off today than they have ever been with regard to this question. I know that our social agencies have fewer cases where the efficient cause is intemperance than ever before."

PALESTINE CONTINUES TO HOLD A LARGE PLACE IN THE WORLD'S interest, and is by no means ignored in the world's news. People view it from different angles—religious, historical, racial, political, commercial—but they continue to read about it and speculate as to the future of that land whence sprang the religion that has so profoundly moved mankind. Whatever the future may hold, it is certain that great changes are occurring in the present. The United Presbyterian gives this summary of what is going on there:

"Conditions are rapidly changing in Palestine since the British occupation. Every feature of Palestinian life is rapidly changing. Great objectives are being pushed which will transform the entire land. Vast tracts are being planted in orange groves. The discovery of unparalleled deposits of potash in and near the Red Sea will probably produce one of the largest industrial enterprises of the age. Oil pipelines are being laid from the Mosul fields to Haifa, which will make this one of the greatest harbors on the Mediterranean. Plans are being carried out for harnessing the Jordan. Two reservoirs will be built; one on the Jordan and one on Yamuk River. Four canals are projected—one from the Sea of Galilee into the Jordan River; one from Yamuk into the Sea of Galilee and one from Yamuk Reservoir to the Jordan. Until two or three years ago it was possible to see Palestine very much as it was in the days of Jesus. All this is rapidly passing."

CHURCHES AND OTHER RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS HAVE OFTEN been accused of neglecting their worn out and aged workers, and unfortunately there is enough truth in the charge to make it embarrassing. But religious bodies are not alone in this. There have been men whose years of toil, often in the face of much discouragement, has made the world richer and life more enjoyable, yet they toiled for others to reap, sometimes coming close to want, if they did not actually feel it. The Presbyterian Advance gives this item which, if correct, certainly justifies the question, why one of our greatest American industries does not do something for one of its pioneers:

“A contemporary tells something of the story of David Buick under the caption, ‘The Tragedy of David Buick.’ Mr. Buick developed the famous auto which carries his name all over the country, but his health broke and to meet pressing needs he sold his large holdings, now worth millions of dollars, for an insignificant sum. Now he is unable to own an auto himself, but, 74 years of age, earns his living as an instructor in the Detroit School of Trades. That reads like a tragic story. Yet it is really a story of heroism, for we are told that Mr. Buick is neither discouraged nor unhappy and gives no evidence of considering himself defeated in life. He may have lost much which men count as worth having, but he has retained a strong and cheerful spirit, which comes not from wealth nor position.”

WE ARE, MOST OF US, INFECTED WITH THE SPIRIT OF MODERN activity. The disposition is to count that moment lost in which nothing is done that can be observed outwardly. Moreover, we must be “in the center of things”; we are losing the art of working alone. Solitude, deliberation, meditation are terms that apply less and less to life today. On the other hand, it is quite true that mental activity alone, apart from human association and from actual work, will accomplish nothing. A balanced life needs both experiences, as emphasized by this quotation, appearing in *The Christian Advocate*, from a letter by Roger W. Babson:

“It would be unfair for me to speak for others, but for myself let me say that all my creative ideas have come to me

when in solitude. They have not been executed or marketed in solitude. One may plan his work in solitude, but he cannot work out his plans under such conditions. Hence I say that all features of life from the monastery to the mill have their economic uses. However, it is very apparent that today the mill is receiving too much attention and the monastery too little. Sunday observance is not simply a religious rite but an economic need as well. A successful nation requires that its people give a proper proportion of their time to meditation and quiet.

"The great creative plans that have made the world progress have been born in solitude. Very few new, worthwhile ideas have come to you or anyone else while in an office. Crowds have their use, but they are useless for creative and original work. The thoughts and inspirations which have built America have been born in garrets, in the woods and on streams away from people.

"Hence my appeal for solitude, which offers the greatest source of power, the greatest mine of wealth and the greatest opportunity for spiritual growth—within the reach of all."

UNLESS ONE IS FOND OF CONTROVERSY, HE IS LIKELY TO AVOID the subject of evolution, which has become practically a political issue in certain states. It is obviously a difficult thing, in a free country, for either side to pass legislation to impose the dogmatic teaching of its own view upon the children of its opponents. When opinion on a subject is so sharply, even bitterly, divided, educators may wisely avoid attempting final deliverances to young people, as *The Daily News*, of Chicago, says in this bit of advice:

"Not all scientific naturalists accept the so-called Darwinian theory of the descent of man. The late St. Mivart, for example, and the late Alfred Russell Wallace, the codiscoverer of natural selection, or the survival of the fittest, asserted in all their works that biological evolution failed to account for man's uniqueness, and that an act that popularly might be termed special creation had to be postulated to explain the chasm between the highest orders of animals and *homo sapiens*.

"Why, then, should not school text-books and lectures to pupils present the several theories of human development, without dogmatically upholding any one of them?"

THE PROPOSAL TO SIMPLIFY THE CALENDAR BY ADAPTING A YEAR of thirteen months is attracting the attention of the general public. Our government has evidently considered the matter of some importance, since the Secretary of State has appointed a committee to represent this country by acting with the one named by the League of Nations. A new calendar will be of such great importance to the church that The United Presbyterian has conferred a favor by publishing a summary of the history of our calendar and the proposed change, most of which we give here:

"Until about eight centuries before Christ, the calendars of nations usually dated from the ascension of a king or of a dynasty, and so would differ in different countries.

"Seven hundred and seventy-six years before Christ the Greeks established a calendar dating from the time when the Olympic games were made a regular event.

"The Romans adopted a calendar dating from the supposed founding of that city by Romulus, 753 B. C. In 46 B. C. Julius Caesar, guided by the calculations of the great mathematician Sosigenes, introduced the Julian calendar by which the year was made to consist of 365 days with an extra day every fourth year. He also made the year commence with January 1. It was based on the Julian system which had ten months instead of twelve, beginning with March. We have a reminder of this in the names of the last four months—September meaning the seventh month, October the eighth, November the ninth and December the tenth. Under the Julian system the twelve months were regularly arranged to contain thirty-one and thirty days alternatively, except that February had twenty-nine. According to this arrangement, July which had been named after Julian had thirty-one days. This was regarded by that worthy as eminently proper, but the next month, August, named after Augustus, his successor, had but thirty, which was eminently unsatisfactory to that illustrious ruler, who proceeded to take a day from February and add it to August and then rearranged the three following months so that there would not be three thirty-ones coming together.

"To provide for the fact that the year, instead of being three hundred and sixty-five days in length, is a quarter of a day longer, a day was added to February every fourth year. But instead of being exactly $365\frac{1}{4}$ days it lacks that amount

by eleven minutes and fourteen seconds which required another and later change.

"In the year 525 A. D., Dionysius, a learned monk in Italy, introduced the Christian calendar, which was practically the amended Julian calendar, except that it dated from the birth of Christ instead of from the founding of Rome. He mistook the date of Christ's birth by three or four years.

"This calendar has not been satisfactory because the months were of different lengths. This has caused much inconvenience to employers of labor and in many other ways where time is counted by the month. For a number of years the European nations, as well as our own, have been discussing a change in the calendar. The idea was to make the months of equal length. Requests were made a few years ago for plans. One hundred and eighty-five were submitted. These were referred to the League of Nations with the request that it assume charge of the revision and that it ask the United States to co-operate. The plan adopted was devised by M. B. Cotsworth, statistician of the Northeastern Railways in England. It divides the year into thirteen months of twenty-eight days each. By this method, the days of the week fall upon the same day of the month."

"The new month will be called Sol and will come between June and July. The three hundred and sixty-fifth day will be an extra day and will be called the Year Day. It will be the twenty-ninth day of December. 'Leap Day' will come once in four years on June 29. By this arrangement Easter will fall every year on April 8."

BOOKS

THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE OF FORGIVENESS ¹

THIS volume is one in a series comprising the Library of Constructive Theology, of which such well-known names as Sir James Marchant and H. Wheeler Robinson are listed as editors. A succeeding volume by the latter on *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit* may be reviewed in a later issue.

Two underlying aims of this series are stated. The first is, to meet the present crisis in theological thought, not by the medium of apologetics, but by "a candid, courageous and well-informed effort to think out anew, in the light of modern knowledge, the foundation affirmations of our common Christianity" (p. vii). The second aim is, to stress as the starting point of reconstruction "the value and validity of religious experience and to develop their theology on the basis of the religious consciousness" (p. viii).

There can be no denial of the fact that this is in harmony with the spirit and method of modern thought, and is all the more welcome for that reason. A Harvard professor in a recent book writes:

"The wise theologian is also a scientist. Applying the test of pragmatism, he asks the question, 'How does it work, what are the results in human lives of each possible interpretation of the experience under consideration?' He answers the question by the appeal to facts of observation and experiment, not by any a priori reasoning nor by any consideration of what he thinks the results ought to be." (K. F. Mather: *Science in Search of God*, p. 146.)

And so it is the contention of the editors above referred to "that the moral and spiritual experience of mankind has the right to be considered, and demands to be understood" (p. viii). In the inner life of the soul there is to be found the

¹ *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness*. By H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil., D.D., Professor of Theology, New College, Edinburgh. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1927. Pp. xvi+299. Index.

ground of assurance and knowledge of the ways of God with men. To be sure, that does not mean that the appeal to experience involves in any way either a minimizing of sound thinking or an ignoring of the Scriptures as an authoritative source. Experience here is viewed as the whole experience of the human race so far as it has shared in the Christian consciousness. Indeed, one of the many valuable features of this book is the wide scope of its discussion.

The choice of Dr. Mackintosh for this task was a happy one, for he combines with clear thinking and the finest scholarship a conviction and evangelical passion that bring to the reader inspiration as well as intellectual persuasion. The author's reputation on both sides the Atlantic as one of the outstanding theological thinkers of the day will be enhanced among those who read this work.

Another feature which commends this book is the timeliness of the subject. The need of forgiveness has been minimized or denied in these days when sin is redefined away and beauty is substituted for righteousness. And even conservative writers of theology have too often failed, in their emphasis on forensic ideas of justification, to do justice adequately to the doctrine of the experience of forgiveness. And so it is satisfying to have this book of nearly three hundred pages based from the beginning on the conviction that forgiveness is a central fact in Christian experience, and therefore "is one of the *foci*—although not necessarily the only one—from which it is at once possible and natural to survey the whole circumference of Christian truth, and to determine the relationship which obtains between one conviction and another" (p. 1). Not only so, but forgiveness is of importance in the practice of personal religion. "No man can properly rank as a Christian, in the sense of the New Testament, who has not received the forgiveness of sins, or who is not conscious that through its impartation something has happened of decisive moment for his relation to God" (p. 2).

Furthermore, Professor Mackintosh holds that it is the fundamental significance of forgiveness in the teaching of Jesus

that enabled Christianity to triumph over and displace the rival religions of the time:

"It triumphed not because it was the religion most hospitable to fresh ideas, not merely because its moral and social doctrine was of higher character than its rivals, or because it was the best fitted to win educated minds. It is the new element in a faith that tells, and Christianity overcame by means of its message of forgiveness, in which it had no rival. . . . The faith which ventures on a gospel so great has the future in its hand." (P. 21 f.)

Now, if this be so, it is imperative that one seek to know what sin is and what forgiveness is, and how they are related in Christian experience. Space does not permit a detailed discussion of the answer to these questions as it is developed in the succeeding chapters. But a few sentences from some of the most important chapters will indicate the general direction and tone of the argument. The thesis is restated in chapter II in these terms:

"To be saved, for a Christian man, is to have trustful communion with God as His child and with men as a brother among brethren; and the position taken in these pages is that the fundamental and creative act whereby salvation in this sense is made and kept real, is the forgiveness of sins. Pardon is not the end of God's ways with men, but it is the blessing which leads in all others by the hand." (P. 24.)

How is this done? How may the barrier alienating man and God be removed so that moral communion may be restored?

"To the man who asks, 'Can I be cleansed? Must I forever bear this load?' . . . an answer comes and makes itself credible: 'I am thy salvation; only believe'. He who grasps and holds this fast is a pardoned man. He is justified; he is righteous, in the sense that he is right with God and in inmost spirit is as God would have him be. He has peace with the Father and can know it, and the Father is at peace with him. The New Testament has no meaning if it does not mean this, and mean it as the staple of its message." (P. 23 f.)

The author readily admits the difficulty of this very wonderful conception as defying logical demonstration. Truth

finally is not proved by logical syllogisms, but is experienced. No great spiritual reality can ever be demonstrated to one who has not known it from within:

“But though not to be explained, it can none the less be experienced as something irresistibly borne in upon the mind that submits itself, with candour, to the impression of Jesus Christ. The point, however, is that it *is* experienced as that which passes all understanding. It is the breaking of eternity into time, the intervention of a love beyond all measures, a supernatural event not deducible by any human calculus from the nature of the universe but rather the spontaneous and unanalysable deed of God.” (P. 35.)

This chapter contains near its close a review of the significance of modern psychology as it bears on the subject. And the author concludes, with Dr. E. J. Bicknell:

“Psychology can teach us nothing about the essential nature of sin or original sin. It has thrown much light on the psychical machinery of sin. . . . But from the standpoint of pure theology the idea of sin still remains unaffected. Our acceptance or rejection of the Christian view of sin must be determined on other grounds than those of psychology.” (P. 45.)

Sin and guilt are next considered (chapter III) in the demand they make for forgiveness. Sin is defined as “the lack or refusal of faith and love. . . . Sin then is the claim, explicit or implicit, to live independently of God and to put something, whether self or world, in His place. It is in fact *godlessness*, the will that for us there should be no God at all.” (P. 61.) But the need of forgiveness arises not merely from the act of sin, but from the sense of guilt which one’s sin brings to a man. Yet this sense of guilt is also one’s hope, for “willingness to accuse ourselves is evidence that He has not wholly forsaken us” (p. 67). Here as elsewhere in the book the views of Ritschl are stated and analyzed and, in this instance, strongly contested.

Then the author proceeds in another chapter to examine the personality of Jesus as He is portrayed in the Gospels, and shows that He is the supreme and the only ground for the con-

viction that forgiveness is fully credible. For the soul in darkness, conscious of the need of forgiveness and asking how it may be done, "it is solely in the person of Jesus that clear light is found" (p. 79 f.). And again:

"It is simple psychological fact, I am persuaded, that the only people in the world to-day who live in the glad consciousness that their sins have been forgiven are those who have encountered Jesus" (p. 83).

And this is because we have learned in Jesus "to know how God would have us think of Himself," because we have been able to discern in Christ "not merely that God is love, but what *kind* of love this is," and we have discovered that, most wonderful of all, it is a love that forgives, awakening in the soul trust and joy. The emphasis of this chapter, on Jesus' attitude of loving friendliness and goodwill toward sinners as the central fact of His ministry and the interpretation it offers of His dealings with sinners, makes it one of the most valuable in the book. One would like to quote from it at length, but reference may be made to the closing sentences in which Dr. Mackintosh, calling attention again to the impression that Jesus' look and voice and touch made in awakening hope and bringing comfort to sinful men and women, asks, in view of the fact that He is no longer with us in the flesh:

"Are we then worse off than His contemporaries? Not so; for now the Cross is there, and upon it the Crucified, to whom we can turn our longing gaze, and find in the sight all and more than all the persuasiveness which before used to look out of His eyes and bear the knowledge of pardon into the contrite heart. The Cross, as the guarantee of God's forgiving love, has replaced the old actual touch with Jesus in the days of His flesh. . . . and this is one of many reasons why every theory which scouts the notion that He regarded His own death as the pledge of forgiveness must fail to satisfy." (P. 101 f.)

Much might be said in appreciation of the apologetic value of the chapters on St. Paul and Luther. Suffice it to state that their intent is to show that the great convictions which they held and which were summed up in the doctrine of justification

by faith were authentically Christian and had their origin and ground in the view of Jesus given above.

The reader is indebted to the author in the chapter on Luther, not only for the care with which he traces the development, from the early church fathers onward, of a meritorious doctrine of salvation which Luther rejected *in toto*, but also for his analysis of the special emphases of the Reformer's views on justification. Several chapters are devoted to a special discussion of the process of divine atonement for sin, which like a scarlet thread runs through the whole book. They are full of sentences like these:

"But the mind of Jesus at Calvary is the mind of God. This is not an inference of any kind, but a direct transcript of experience. . . . the cross reveals in a final and forever unmistakable way God's mind regarding sin and His active attitude towards it." (P. 203.)

But we must pass these by and call attention in closing to an interesting view expressed in the closing chapter on Forgiveness and the Church. It is an argument for the necessity of a corporate Christianity based on the assertion made "without hesitation" that, "The life of the Church . . . is for each of us the medium of Divine pardon, and a medium which, so far from being accidental or arbitrary, is ethically indispensable" (p. 276). The argument is advanced in such statements as these:

"The Church forms the channel by which forgiveness reaches men, because it is solely through the Church's witness that they become aware of the Gospel of Jesus" (p. 276).

"Apart from this witness of the fellowship, faith in God's redeeming love cannot begin. . . . Apart from the society of believers, forgiveness is a mere word without the impulse of personal witness behind it, a word that will never be heard unless there are forgiven men to speak it." (P. 278.)

And this means that,

"All who long for pardon need, before the longing can be satisfied, to encounter those who have seen and believed the love of God in Jesus Christ" (p. 280).

"The Church, however, makes Divine forgiveness credible

not only by this heartfelt testimony to its reality and blessedness, but by the ethical attitude of Christians to each other" (p. 281).

'And this is one the reasons why the Christian message has not made a deeper mark on the world.

"This human coefficient of forgiving love, required to add momentum to the good news, has in great measure been absent" (p. 283).

"It is only when the air is warm with brotherhood that the Gospel sounds true" (p. 284).

This book will enable one to say with deeper appreciation and with a new sense of responsibility, "I believe in the forgiveness of sins."

PAUL C. WARREN.

THE SPIRITUAL ELEMENT IN HISTORY ²

THIS choice and stimulating book has been two years in getting to the reviewer's desk. It was well worth waiting for. We have long needed a thoroughgoing and impartial discussion of the question of God in history from the viewpoint, not of the theologian or the apologist, but of the historian. The author of this book is ideally fitted, one may perhaps venture to say Providentially fitted, for the undertaking. He is a believer in the spiritual element in history, specifically and avowedly Christian. The last sentence of his book is:

"Because of these two facts [the perfection of Christ's character and the perfection of His teaching], when Christ affirms a truth that I cannot demonstrate, I accept the affirmation as an act of faith, even the affirmation that God is in history."

On the other hand, Mr. McLaughlin is so thoroughly confirmed and established in the historical habit and method that he not only sees the whole problem with the eyes of a historian, but has facile control of the technique of his science. In illustration of this statement attention is called to the fact that the

² The Spiritual Element in History. By Robert W. McLaughlin. New York: The Abingdon Press. 1926. Pp. 312. Index.

author discusses thirteen difficulties in the historian's way in accepting what he calls the "fourth assumption" of historical procedure, namely, the activity of God in history. It is safe to say that there are few writers who deal so fully with the problems involved in the idea of God's activity in human affairs, who at the same time have been able to pass through these to positive and affirmative positions.

A few general remarks about the book may fittingly be introduced at this point. In the first place, it is emphatically beaten oil. There are no lost motions, no wasted words. The author deals entirely with vital matters. Every separate theme is stripped of wrappings and husks, and the essential issues set forth with utter clearness.

In the second place, the analysis is so complete that one is able to follow the argument throughout. It is like walking in a plain path. You are never at a loss to know where you are and where you are going.

Third, the illustrations taken from history, while comparatively few, are admirably chosen and effective. They simply have to be stated in order to show their fitness and cogency.

Fourth, from the point of view of one whose chief interest is in the treatment of Christianity, the book is almost beyond praise. For note, that the convincing element in the treatment of this phase of the subject is that it is consistently historical. When Christ and Christianity appear it is in line with and along the pathway of historical investigation. Let me give a striking instance. The author is speaking of certain facts which point to the solution of the problem involved in the thought of God in history. One of these (p. 292 f.) is the "value of the catastrophic as evidence of progress." He gives several instances in which wicked, cruel, and wasteful things have released men to higher things. He speaks of these events as "glints." Then he says:

"Finally, what a flood of light—not merely glints of light—is thrown upon the spiritual meaning of the catastrophic as we gaze reverently upon the supreme catastrophe of history—the cross of Christ" (p. 294).

Later, when the fact of Christianity is dealt with, the same historical restraint is exercised. We see Christianity, not doctrinally, but as it appears to the eye of the alert and the open-minded historian. He begins with the portrait of Christ in the Gospels, and from that point proceeds to describe His influence in history—simply as a spiritual force. He summarizes thus:

“Measured both by time and space Christianity is the most stupendous event of history” (p. 297).

And this statement leads us to point out another element in the discussion before us. Mr. McLaughlin affirms that the forces, or to be more correct, three types of energy, have been operative in history. These three co-operative energies, always working together, have been separately considered and exclusively emphasized, for example, the spiritual by Augustine, the intellectual by Hegel, and the physical by Marx. Mr. McLaughlin gives due place and emphasis to all three of these types of energy and is thus able to give a unified and harmonious interpretation of historical facts, preparing the way for an ultimately spiritual interpretation of history which includes and harmonizes the other co-operative factors.

One of the most interesting and valuable phases of the entire discussion is contained in the second chapter, which is entitled *How? The Person*. The first chapter is *Why? The Meaning*, and the third *What? The Evidence*.

The second chapter states the fundamental and controlling fact that “history has no meaning apart from the person.” The romance and the difficulty of history alike consist in the discovery and interpretation of the person. The author asks, “How is history made?” Then says:

“The answer is, By the person—individual or collective, as he is interpreted through his recorded acts. These acts, in whatever form, constitute the material of history. As this material is understood the history is made. To do this the person must be found. Until he is found there can be no history. For history is interpretation—the person interpreted in his recorded acts.” (P. 81.)

Herein is found the ground and basis of all sound philoso-

phy of history. A better introduction to the whole undertaking of trying to master the essential principals of historical study would be difficult to find.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CHARACTER ³

THIS is the most important and valuable work on the psychology of character that has come to the attention of the reviewer. Within the limited compass of this review it is impossible to give the reader any adequate idea of the scope of its contents. What it is remembered that character has been a fascinating subject for study from the very beginning of human association—and that means from the dawn of human experience—the task of giving a survey of the history of this subject becomes evident. No modern has had the courage to attempt this intellectual feat before.

In his courses on the subject of Personality Professor Roback tells us he has been confronted by the lack of a comprehensive work covering the field of character in its widest sense, and at the same time offering a tentative plan for handling the subject scientifically. It is this twofold scheme which the author has endeavored to work out in this volume. He is anxious to have the reader realize the amount of research which has been put into its accomplishment. Upon this point, he says in his Preface:

"I have at least spared myself no pains to follow religiously the project conceived. In order to illumine the numerous angles from which the subject has been approached, it was necessary to compress practically a whole library into the compass of a single volume, and, substituting the word 'vocal' for that of 'syllable' in the couplet of Cowper, '*Chase a panting vocal through time and space*'; and even if this hunt involved making excursions into the psychological literature of half a dozen languages, besides the three principal mediums of scientific thought." (P. ix f.)

³ The Psychology of Character. With a Survey of Temperament. By Dr. A. A. Roback. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc. 1927. Pp. xxiv+595. Indexes.

The author demonstrates that even a scholar capable of such exhaustive and tireless research work, and a Harvard professor, is at heart still very human. The above recital of the pursuit of his subject "through time and space" is followed by this human exclamation:

"How much easier it would have been to follow the general practice of devoting less space to the views of other people and more to one's own presentation! . . . But it should be born in mind that a writer on a subject like character, unless he approaches his task from a purely literary avenue, must lay before the reader an assortment of representative doctrines and treatments so as to furnish a proper background which might serve also as a guide in gaining a perspective of the field as a whole." (P. x.)

But the hardest blow for him to bear was to have one of his own colleagues in the field of psychology fail to appreciate the work done by him, and its value. His comment upon this incident is so rarely human that it must be given:

"I have rather stressed the positive phase of selection because of the wide diversity of views on the subject, which may be considered representative. This was in no way an easy undertaking; and when a colleague, also interested in characterology, on glancing at one of the historical chapters on temperament remarked that 'it is a good thing if one likes such work as this,' he was hardly appreciating the fact that the task of poring over old discussions on temperament in order to secure a basis of comparison was irksome beyond words. Nevertheless someone has to do it." (P. x.)

These little human touches are inserted so that the reader may be assured that he is following, in this study, the leadership of a real human professor. And if Professor Roback was able to do so much research work that was "irksome beyond words," he has demonstrated that he possesses character of his own kind; for he was able to inhibit his instinctive urge to give up because the task was hard, dry, and tedious. So he has a right to expect the reader to demonstrate that he has enough character to inhibit his natural instinctive desire to avoid a book of 595 pages on character. For the convenience of the

reader the subject matter of the book is divided into four parts: Part I, Historical; Part II, Classification of Characters; Part III, Movements and Methods; Part IV, Constructive.

As we go over these divisions and discover that the author has generously devoted 446 pages out of his 595 to the views of others, we understand why he felt somewhat virtuous about having strength of character enough to inhibit his instinctive urge of egoism sufficiently to give the lion's share of his valuable space to the views of others.

The difficulty which the scientific writer encounters in his study of character arises from the fact that the popular mind has never distinguished more than two kinds of character. "They are either good or bad, strong or weak, noble or base, of a high or a low type." And in all of these distinctions there is present an ethical appraisal. They are in the field of value rather than in the realm of facts. And yet there has always been, side by side with this popular conception, a very persistent attempt to reduce these appraisals to sound scientific treatment. Thus one has to follow a two-fold path in this study, the literary avenue and the scientific pathway. Those words have been deliberately chosen, for they express the contrast which is seen in the width of the two ways. The literary study of character, which depends upon penetration, insight, intuitive synthesis, in its understanding and appreciation of character, is the broad road that may lead to destruction, if one does not watch out. The scientific pathway is a narrow way, though not as straight as it should have been, that leads to fact and truth.

In the historical survey, the author follows both of these routes from their starting point down to modern times. When he begins his own constructive contribution, he leaves the literary, intuitive, synthetic field and devotes himself to the scientific. This restricted area shuts out the religious and ethical problems that so naturally arise in the study of character. The reader must realize that this restriction is in the interests of scientific progress. As will be seen, the author's unqualified

insistence upon the recognition of "regulative principles," even though, as a psychologist, he does not extend these beyond the realm of the human, leaves the door open for all the objective data beyond the human range, which other sciences and philosophy are able to establish as entitled to recognition.

Hippocrates with his "bodily humors" divided human beings into four outstanding types: The sanguine temperament, the melancholic temperament, the choleric temperament, and the phlegmatic temperament. The scientific mind soon began to ask the question, Why are these types in existence? What makes one person sanguine, another melancholic, another choleric, another phlegmatic? Galen, the Greco-Roman physician, answered, "The condition of their blood." So here we have the first recorded scientific explanation of differences of temperament:

"The sanguine person, always full of enthusiasm, was said to owe his temperament to the strength of the blood, the melancholic's sadness was supposed to be due to the overfunctioning of black bile, the choleric's irritability was attributed to the predominance of the yellow bile in the body, while the phlegmatic person's apparent slowness and apathy were traced to the influence of the phlegm" (p. 11).

This first guess started the scientific ball rolling, and it has never stopped for any length of time since. Modern scientists are still guessing, but they are guessing progressively. From temperament and the emotions the problem shifted to the field of the mind and ideas, then to physiology and temperature, the speed of the circulation of the blood, the brain, the nerves, the glands, the subconscious, complexes, until the whole gamut of the psycho-physical mechanism has been credited with responsibility for the foundation of character. Professor Roback gives every theory a fair hearing—the English, the French, the Teutonic, the Dutch, the Russian, the Hungarian, the Italian, the South American. The only sections of the world that are omitted are the Orient and Africa. It would be asking too much of one scholar to expect him to be able to cover these distant civilizations.

Having presented every important theory that has won any recognition among scientific minds, to the surprise of most moderns Professor Roback goes back to the instinct theory for the basis of his psychology of character. The question which confronts the psychologist is thus phrased: "But to what psychological entities, then, can we hitch character?" The author's answer is:

"*The Instincts.* We shall soon see that through such a procedure we can meet the requirement of the man in the street, and at the same time move safely on psychological territory without taking recourse to hazy categories combined in sets of two or three. An instinct, after all, notwithstanding the attempts made in certain quarters to evict it from the psychological purview, is a definite mechanism which operates visibly enough to convince us of its existence." (P. 449.)

Professor Roback is convinced that the instinct is the psychological entity to which character is hitched. He argues as follows:

"Roughly speaking, one of the major differences between men and infra-human beings is that the latter do not inhibit their instinctive impulses except after a painful training; and that is the chief reason why character cannot be ascribed to animals" (p. 449).

We are now ready to receive this statement of the author's theory:

"My definition of character accordingly is as follows: *An enduring psychophysical disposition to inhibit instinctive impulses in accordance with a regulative principle*" (p. 450).

Following this definition we read:

"Each of these conditions must be fulfilled before character can be attributed to the individual. The possession of instinctive urges is of prime importance. The inhibition of the urge stamps the agent with character, though of varying degrees. Not, however, until we have the regulative principle as a clue, can we determine to what extent the man or woman we are judging possesses character." (P. 450.)

These demands make use of the tripartite division of the

mind, which is so fundamental to human experience. So we read:

"Since every instinct is grounded in both conation and affection, and since inhibition is wholly a matter of conation, and finally since the determining factor of this inhibition is or has been reflection of some kind, we perceive that the older categories still have a place in our scheme when properly arranged so as to form a synthesis, the affective part furnishing the condition, the conative supplying the raw content, and the cognitive factor colouring it with significance, giving it status and suggesting a possibility of measurement" (p. 450).

We are on a well-rounded psychological basis in this theory, and it opens up many unexpected ways for ethical values to enter. Take this observation:

"As regards the logical principle regulating the inhibition, it must be pointed out that inasmuch as different people will be guided by different principles or sanctions, there will be various degrees of character. Little boots it to say that we all rationalize our actions. *It is the type of rationalization which counts.* In our everyday life we can recognize this especially in our dealings with men (and perhaps women, too). Some excuses we accept as reasonable, others we reject as chronic alibis." (P. 451.)

This leads to stabilizing character in the following manner:

"As a rule, the *man of character in the full sense of the word exercises a distributed inhibitory power in keeping with a general principle which subsumes under its authority more specialized maxims*" (p. 452).

At this point the author stops to clear up a most confused problem in the field of character. He remarks:

"Nor are we to infer that character is attached to the operation of the so-called higher, altruistic, or other-regarding instincts as against the baser, egoistic, or self-regarding congenital urges. . . . What I should like to emphasize is that characters are evaluated *from the point of view of such principles as truth and justice rather than on the strength of altruistic tendencies.*" (P. 453.)

All this opens the way for intelligence and reason to function in the development of character. So we read:

"Each particular inhibition of an instinct *derives its significance only from the logical motive* which governs the restraint" (p. 461).

And this leads to this important observation:

. . . "the *highest types of characters can be realized only in the highest types of intelligence*" (p. 465).

The practical application of this theory can be summed up in this maxim:

"*Inhibit your instinctive tendency in accordance with the principle of consistency as you would wish it observed from the angle of an impartial spectator.* . . . It is no longer a question of what *you* would like done, but what the detached judge in *you* would have done." (P. 487.)

One feels instantly the similarity of this maxim to the Golden Rule. But, the one is in the realm of ethics, the other in that of psychology. The author discusses this difference. He also deals with many kindred problems which arise in these two fields.

But we must hasten on to his final statements. He is very insistent upon the point that "character stands for individuality in conduct," so that the elements of personality are all carefully conserved, and also personal responsibility. Inhibition is the technique of character. "Primarily then the difference between one degree of character and another is a difference of inhibitability." (See p. 561.)

The psychological machinery which functions when character is operating is set in one concluding statement:

"The machinery of character involves the inhibition of original or inborn tendencies just as musical composition necessitates the mastery of a certain technique; but the inhibition in itself, just as the technique as such, possesses very little value. It is the direction which the inhibition or the technique takes that is all-important. Both man and beast work along the line of least resistance, but it is for *man to change high resistance into low resistance* by adhering to a rational guiding principle—a purpose." (P. 564.)

One must not expect too much of an initial study in this

very complex field of personality. Nothing but good can come from this masterly and courageous treatment of the whole subject of characterology. The religious and ethical readers are going to be forced to show their character by the way in which they inhibit their desires to criticize the author because he has kept so strictly to the field of psychology. But that was his duty. When the question of dynamics arises, and we ask, How are we going to get the power to run this psychological machinery of character? religion will enter.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

LIFE AND I ⁴

THIS title, *Life and I*, rather surprises the psychologist, for he has so long been dominated by the behaviorist in psychology and the determinist in sociology that he finds it hard to believe that the self, or I, exists. Yet Mr. Bradford writes this book as though he had never heard of these self destroying theories. There is some excuse for this startling interest in the I which our author shows. For he has been a biographer for thirty years, and has spent his life studying great personalities. So that personality means more to him than to the selfless psychologists. As long as one is reading this book personality will seem a very real thing.

After the surprise occasioned by this title has subsided, it is followed by a momentary suspicion that the writer is going to feature himself and his life reactions. And one wonders whether they are going to be worth reading. But when the subtitle is added—*An Autobiography of Humanity*—this suspicion vanishes. The author dispels any further misunderstanding upon this point by his first paragraph:

"This is the book of I, not of one particular I, but of the general human I that fills and makes the world. . . .

"The universal community of the I is the justification for constantly introducing my own feelings and experience. Without such justification, to do this would be worse than imper-

⁴*Life and I. An Autobiography of Humanity.* By Gamaliel Bradford. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1928. Pp. 307.

tinent, it would be uninteresting. But my experience is so largely your experience, and your experience mine, that it is possible to shift easily and naturally from one to the other, and to use both to illustrate each other in different phases and different connections." (P. 1.)

Now we are ready for the fundamental assumption upon which the author rests his treatment of the whole subject:

"In one sense the I is the greatest thing in the world. There have even been those who maintained that it was the only thing in the world. It may also be said to be the littlest, prettiest thing in the world." (P. 3.)

In order to keep out of all kinds of entanglements as he treats the different phases of his theme, Mr. Bradford hastens to explain that he makes no pretence to philosophical theorizing, nor is he inspired by any impulse to make the world over or make it better, or to make men other than they are. He is going to describe the struggle of the I with life just as it takes place. He states this purpose in these words:

"My endeavor is simply to make a dramatic presentation of the greatest dramatic struggle of the world, that between the I and the Not-I, between this everlastingly aggressive all engrossing self and the objects that attract or repel it, the manifold, conflicting forces against which it must assert itself triumphantly, or else tragically and miserably perish." (P. 4.)

In this dramatic struggle our author finds the I facing Love, Power, Beauty, Thought, Religion. And in each conflict the I finds itself threatened. Shall it yield or control? In every instance the answer of the self is dual. It gives and takes. This is the history of human experience.

The chapters on Love, Power, Beauty, and Thought bring this struggle out most convincingly. They are enriched with the wide knowledge of the author, and his gift for writing, but they do not furnish any special problems for our field. It is in those chapters on Religion that we find ourselves particularly concerned. To this subject half of the chapters of the book are devoted.

The sympathetic spirit in which Mr. Bradford handles the different problems of religion will surprise the reader who knows

that for his whole adult life he has been estranged from the church and unrelated to personal religious problems as they develop in one's devotional life. These chapters give a good idea of the way the mind of a well-disposed, intelligent, cultured man works when it functions in a field where he is a stranger to that type of personal experience which enables one to understand. A sample of fairmindedness in observation is seen in this quotation:

"But in this prolonged, unceasing, perhaps hopeless battle with the I, it will hardly be denied that Christ, the belief in Christ, the acceptance of Christ, has been one of the most mighty and effective instruments" (p. 233).

This statement is thus confirmed:

"For centuries those who have been driven almost to despair by the persistent onset of their sins and passions, and the warring tumult in their members, have turned to that high, pure source of strength and comfort, and found peace" (p. 233).

These two statements are followed by this observation:

"To me it appears that the chief value of this agency of Christ lies in the belief in his divinity, his actual oneness with God, and as a consequence of that oneness, his taking upon himself the sins of humanity and by his divine mediation washing them away" (p. 233).

These are some of the facts about religion which Mr. Bradford finds in human experience, and so he records them. Their validity and explanation he leaves to others to settle. These chapters are so unusual and so stimulating that one is tempted to make this statement, and close the review. But this would be unfair to the author, the reader, and the reviewer. For the reader would purchase the book laboring under an entirely wrong impression of the author's religious point of view, and reading would soon arouse the feeling that some deception had been practiced by the reviewer. So a further word of criticism is necessary.

The truth is, there is a profound psychological difference between the first four, and the last four chapters. This difference, as we sense it, lies in the fact that, when the author de-

scribes the struggle of the I with Love, Power, Beauty, Thought, he speaks with authority derived from the fact that he is on the inside of the group, an experiencing member of it, and so understands. When he writes about Religion, it is as an outsider, sympathetic, fair, but incapable of understanding the experiences with which he is dealing. He does not understand how any intelligent Christian who knows as much about historical criticism of the Bible, Christology, theology and philosophy as he knows, can remain an enthusiastic believer and a devoted participator in the full range of Christian religious experience. And yet there are Biblical scholars who have spent a lifetime in the study of these problems and still find in the Book what he has never found.

Mr. Bradford does not understand because he has stood outside the realm of experience. He tells us that he has not read his Bible for thirty years, and would not have read it at this time but for the necessity of going over the Gospels for the purpose of writing this book. He tells us that he has not been in a church for a religious service for the same length of time, and that during that period he has never consciously disciplined himself at the behest of the religious personalities of God or Christ. Taking all this into consideration, we feel that Mr. Bradford has done remarkably well in his treatment of the problems of the I and religion. At least he is specialist enough in personalities to sense that the I reacts to religious experience in terms of personalities. So the titles of these last four chapters are: Christ and I, Christ and Not-I, Christ and More Than I, Christ and I and God.

We are sure that if an artist should take a man past middle life, who for thirty years had manifested no interest in art, and turn him loose in the Louvre, and then ask him to write a book of appreciation of the paintings to be found there, he might find this book interesting, though not a reliable guide to correct artistic evaluation of the merits of those works of art. Appreciation of religious experience has in it the same elements of attitude, knowledge, and experience, that artistic appreciation demands. There is no substitute for experience or for the

knowledge that experience brings. We cultivate our sense of appreciation. This is particularly true of an experience as complex as the religious. Mr. Bradford's proposal to take a man of average intelligence, who had never heard of the Christian religion or anything connected with it, and give him the Bible to read would fail entirely of the desired result. For this person would not possess the psychological qualifications to appreciate the Book, any more than the average man who had never come in contact with classical music would appreciate a symphony concert. Adaptation is one of the great words in biological science, and adaptation is a process.

When, after thirty years of neglect, Mr. Bradford opens his Bible and reads the Gospels to see how they impress him, he is not approaching them in an uninfluenced attitude. For back of that experiment is thirty years of deposited disregard, French freethinkers' ideas, critical ideas and attitudes, all of which show their influence in his reactions. If Mr. Bradford had deposited in his mind and heart during those thirty years the knowledge and attitude of the great, devoted, and reverent Biblical scholars, whose knowledge of the problems of historical criticism is surely as great as that of those who have influenced him, and had added to this thirty years of Christian religious experience, we are certain that his experiment of reading over the Gospels would have brought entirely different reactions. Yet, making full allowance for all these limitations, thanks to his splendid early Christian training, he has done remarkably well. And with this word of explanation, we are glad to commend the book as most stimulating and profitable.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

A FLORENTINE DIARY ⁵

READERS of THE BIBLICAL REVIEW will recognize that this book is a little off the beaten trail for a periodical of this sort; but it is so interesting and so valuable, even from a directly religious

⁵ A Florentine Diary. By Luca Landucci. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1927. Pp. xiv+308.

point of view, that the exception may be considered as wisely taken.

Nothing more fascinating than this volume could easily be imagined, for several reasons. In the first place, it is an original and contemporary historical document of the highest value. Readers of Florentine history will recognize at once the fact that most of the books in English which deal with Florence during the period covered by the diary and its continuation (1450-1542) are based directly or indirectly upon Landucci. An original document which is the current record by an actual observer of events is immeasurably more interesting than any derivative or secondary account of the same events can possibly be made. And this narrative is particularly vivid because of the peculiarly individual quality of the man who wrote it. One cannot help wondering whether there could have been many like him in Florence during that brilliant, feverish, dissolute age. If there were many like him in that strange and bewildering city on the Arno, our perspective of Florentine life would be appreciably modified. Suffice it here to note that, in addition to having in Landucci's diary a reliable record of passing events, we are given insight into a noble and attractive soul who lives in the midst of, and yet altogether apart from, the many sinister aspects of life which spell to us Florence in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

With this brief preface, let us now to the story. Luca Landucci was born in 1435 and died in 1516. During a large part of his life he kept an apothecary shop at the Canto de' Tornabuinci. This locality is of intense interest to those of us who are at all familiar with Florence. It is a narrow, flat-iron-shaped spot between the Vigna Nuova and the Spada, two streets which almost come together in the Via Tornabuoni, and separate on the way to the Lung Arno which they reach at different points. Both of these streets are familiar to travelers because on one is a famous antique shop and on the other an American tea room. On the Via Tornabuoni are located both Cook's Office and the American Express. On this narrow space between two streets, just a store front in width, Landucci had

his shop, and through its windows or from its front door the genial apothecary watched the life of Florence, and, be it said with respect, not much escaped his keen old eyes. Just opposite his shop stood the palace of the Strozzi, one of the finest medieval structures in Florence, which Landucci saw in building from the foundation. Not far away were the palaces of the Tornabuoni and the Rucellai. Only a few squares distant was the place of Savonarola's execution. History was made under Landucci's very eyes, and through those eyes we are able to see history in the making—as only it can ever really be seen.

Now just a word about the quality of Landucci. As already suggested, the amazing thing about this apothecary, who might easily have been a prominent citizen but who very wisely chose to be humble and inconspicuous, is that a man of his type could have lived in Florence at this period. He was deeply religious, but without hypocrisy or fanaticism. He was opposed to the Medici, but without bitterness. He was a follower of the Frate Girolamo, but without hatred even for those who put him to death. He had sympathy even for those whose policies he disliked and felt pity even for those whose characters he despised. He literally forgave his enemies, as in the case of the man who wounded his son. He was a clean-living home body in an age of almost universal dissoluteness, honest and self-respecting in an age of graft. One qualification in our admiration of his character should in strict justice be made. He was a cautious soul without either the intensity or the rancor of partisanship and evidently had no genius for martyrdom. We may well be thankful for this, because only thus had he a chance to live long enough to give us the diary. It may not have been timidity which kept him free of the partisan struggles of his time, such as, for example, raged about the Friar of St. Mark's, for he was naturally of a retiring, meditative disposition, an observer rather than an active participant in stirring events. One of the first entries in the diary is of the date of 1458. He says:

“At this time the lantern of the cupola of *Santa Maria del Fiore* [the Duomo] was begun; and the palace of Cosimo de’

Medici; and the churches of San Lorenzo and Santo Spirito, and the Badia on the way to Fiesole [the famous abbey of San Domenico]; also many houses near the walls," etc.

How history does shine through an entry like that! And just glance at this one of the same year:

"And at this same time the following noble and valiant men were living: Archbishop Antonino, who had been a monk in the monastery of *San Marco*, and always continued to wear the habit of the Dominican order, a man who may be called *Beato* (holy); Messer Bartolomeo de' Lapacci, a bishop and preacher excelling all others in our day; Messer Paolo, a doctor, philosopher and astrologer, of holy life; Cosimo, son of Giovanni de Medici, who was called the great merchant, as he had places of business in every part of the town; and to compare anyone to Cosimo de Medici was as much as to say that no richer or more prosperous person existed; Donatello, the sculptor, who made the tomb of Messer Leonardo d' Arezzo in Santa Croce; and Desidero the sculptor, who made the tomb of Messer Carlo d' Arezzo, also in Santa Croce. Later came Rossellino, a very small man, but great in sculpture; he made the tomb of the cardinal in San Miniato, which is in the chapel on the left; Maestro Antonio, an organist, who surpassed every one in his day; Maestro Andreino degl' Impiccati, a painter; Maestro Domenico da Vinegia (Venice), also a painter, was beginning to be spoken of; Maestro Antonio and his brother Piero, called the Pollaiuolo, goldsmiths, sculptors and painters; Maestro Mariano, who taught book-keeping, and also my master Calandra, who taught the same subject, and was a very kind and courteous man."

Here is a portrait gallery of contemporary celebrities, all the more vital and interesting because teachers of bookkeeping are coupled with the deathless names of Antonino and Donatello. This is the way in which men estimate their contemporaries. On the 24th of May, "A Saturday and the eve of the *Spirito Santo*," Landucci was married to Salvestra, granddaughter of Domenico Pagni. In connection with this event occurs this diverting entry: "She had a dowry of 400 florins, in the state funds, praise God"! There follows immediately a full list of the wife's bridal fittings which takes up more than two printed pages of the diary. The naivete of these items is more

than matched by the touching entry which follows the bridal list, out of place so far as date is concerned, but summing up the whole gentle biography of the good Salvestra: "My above-mentioned wife and dear companion, who had not her equal for kindness and virtue, died after living with me for forty-eight years, and never once having given me cause for anger." This book presents a constant temptation to quote. The items range all the way from things connected with popes of his day, historic events which fill many brilliant pages of history, to local events of neighborhood interest and minor events of merely personal and private significance. For example, there is a record on May 26, 1471, of the first sugar imported from Madeira, after the conquest of that island by the King of Portugal. "I had some of the first."

A characteristic incident occurs under date of December 11, 1473:

"A poor woman in Camaldoli, who had several grown-up daughters, was praying to the crucifix in their house, when they saw it break into a sweat, and speaking of it in the neighborhood, people began to go and pray to it. When the Carmelite friars heard of it, they went and fetched it reverently and placed it in a tabernacle in the *Cappella della Croce*, and it was worshipped there."

A note by Del Badia tells us that this is the famous crucifix known as *La Provvidenza*. A very interesting item which illustrates what I have called history in the making occurs under date of January 15, 1476, which tells us that rumors of the death of Charles of Burgundy, who was slain by the soldiers of the Swiss Cantons in the battle of Nancy, had just reached Florence. There follows a vivid description of Charles called the "Bold," but who, as Sir Walter Scott said, should have been called the "Rash," and this striking sentence: "The Lord sometimes frees the world of such men." Landucci attributes the astonishing victory of the Swiss over the superior forces of Charles to the miraculous efficacy of a banner painted with an annunciation and "blessed at the church of the *Nunziata* in Florence."

These quotations are sufficient to give the reader an idea of the value and fascination of this unique book. The worth of it, so far as the student of church history is concerned, will be found in the series of notices of Savonarola, in which the progress of the great drama which centered about the hero of San Marco is graphically depicted. Landucci was himself an admirer and nonmilitant follower of the Frate, and every phase of the long struggle which ended in the flames in the Piazza de Signoria is reflected in the calm, unimpassioned, but thrilling references of the apothecary of the Tornaquinci. One strange item in Landucci's record, not found in the histories, may be cited as a picture of the time and of the man. Under date of June 10, 1498:

"On the meadow of the *Servi* and of the *Tiratoio* certain caterpillars appeared, which devoured everything, so that the sloe-bushes became white and peeled; and within the space of four days these caterpillars turned the color of gold. The boys caught them, saying: *These are Fra Girolamo's caterpillars!* and some looked like gold and some like silver."

Other interesting details are given, and quite an elaborate parable worked out regarding the "golden life" of Savonarola and the evil results which were likely to follow upon his death. The writer of this review has never read anything in connection with Savonarola so stirring and so illuminating as Landucci's scattered notes beginning on December 6, 1494 and ending June 10, 1498. All in all this book, far beyond most books, deserves to be owned and cherished. It is the record of a good life in an evil age, and the very fact that such a life could have been lived then makes us trust that the age was not so evil as it seems.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.

CYPRIAN⁶

THIS treatise, or appeal, by the martyred Bishop of Carthage, who was executed by the Roman proconsul of the Province of

⁶ Cyprian: *De Unitate Ecclesiae*. Texts for Students No. 43. The Latin text, translated, with an Introduction and brief notes. By E. H. Blakeney, M.A. London: The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1928. Pp. vii+64.

Africa in 260 A.D., is a much quoted document. Mr. Blakeney is a distinguished classical professor in Winchester College, England. His forthcoming edition of Horace, *De Arte Poetica*, is expected to be a notable one.

The notes now attached to Cyprian's treatise are few, but of sound value. Of Cyprian Dr. Lightfoot once wrote, "As Cyprian crowned the edifice of episcopal power, as he was the first to put forward without relief or disguise the sacerdotal assumptions." Now this treatise is not, like most of his model, Tertullian, directed against the secular power and persecutions at the hands of the Roman emperors, as Valerian; it is a distinctly intraparietal; it deals with schisms and heresy within the Christian church; with the *lapsi*, whether they may be re-admitted; with the confessors, and their committing of sins *after* they had made their professions before the churches.

The citations, for dogmatic authority, are mostly from the New Testament, the one from *Canticum Canticorum VI, 9* is particularly farfetched and inept. The stern dogma permeating the whole is this: *Nulla salus extra ecclesiam*. Even those adherents of a schism who die as martyrs for Christ cannot be saved. We have then everywhere the extreme and triumphant asseverations of sacerdotalism. But for us, and for the general student of Christian church history, the interest must be concentrated on chapter 4. Cyprian cites Matthew 16:18-19 (a power given also to the other apostles, as Cyprian properly cites John 20:20-23), but he is far from drawing the exclusive inferences which the bishops of Rome did and do. These, or their followers, committed or perpetrated several interpolations, which Professor Blakeney gives to his readers on page vii of his Introduction.

After, "Pasce oves meas" (John 21:15) the following interpolation was added: "On him [Peter] alone he builds his church, and to him he commits the pasturing of his sheep." The second interpolation, after the words, "sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur," is: "Et primatus Petro datur, ut una Christi ecclesia et Cathedra una monstretur. Et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis omnibus

unanimi consensione pascatur" (And the primacy is given to Peter, in order that the *one* church of Christ and the *one* episcopal chair may be shown). The last of the three interpolations, after the words, "Qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit," is: "Qui Cathedram Petri, super quem fundata est ecclesia, deserit" (Who abandons the episcopal chair of Peter, on whom the church is based). A pious fraud, to put it mildly, precisely like the Constantinian Donation, or the Isidorian Decretals—in *maiolem potentiam episcopi Romani*.

Professor Blakeney tells us that, "When in later times Cyprian was edited at Rome by Manutius in 1563, the Roman censors insisted on the interpolated passages being retained, though not found in the Mss." (p. 59). Critics suggest that the interpolations were inserted perhaps since the time of Pope Gelasius (492-496). The student of the Vulgate New Testament will of course be interested in these earlier versions, current in the Latin church in the time of the Carthaginian bishop, about 250 A.D.

Of course we are always delighted to compare the Vulgate text of Jerome with one nearly one hundred and fifty years earlier; the differences are slight. I will content myself with a single parallel, 1 Corinthians 1:10 (Cyprian, *Cap. 8*): "Obsecro vos, fratres, per nomen Domini nostri Jesu Christi ut id ipsum dicatis omnes, et non sint in vobis schismata; sitis autem compositi in eadem sententia." Ephesians 4:2-3: "Supportantes invicem in dilectione satis agentes servare unitatem spiritus in coniunctione pacis." Vulgate, 1 Corinthians 1:10: "Obsecro autem vos, fratres, per nomen Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ut id ipsum dicatis omnes, et non sint in vobis schismata invicem, in *caritate*, *solliciti* servare unitatem Spiritus in vinculo pacis."

The little treatise then, full of meaning for the student of the history of the early church, and edited with great skill and sober limitation, should find its way into all theological seminaries of America.

E. G. SIHLER.